IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

STUDIES
IN THE
ORIGINS
OF
ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

By

Frederic E. Pamp, Jr.

January 1, 1950

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Levin

SUMMARY OF

STUDIES IN THE ORIGINS OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 1, 1950

by

Frederic E. Pamp, Jr.

* * *

This study consists of a general consideration of the nature and development of English Arminianism in preliminary terms, as a preface to a detailed consideration of two crucial events in the early development of the movement: the Lambeth Articles of 1595 and the visit of Hugo Grotius to England in 1613. It is essentially a theological study, of the change of doctrine that took place in the Church of England in the seventeenth century. The usual assumption has been that the doctrinal characteristics of English Arminianism were the product of the direct influence of the Dutch revolt from Calvinism, even though there is evidence that the leaders of the English Church were genuinely puzzled by the charges of Prynne, Fuller, and others that this was the case. The fact is that the core of English Arminianism is English, and its beginnings in England date from long before the days when Arminius had made himself heard. It was, in fact, a development from the mutual inconsistency of two elements in the Elizabethan Church: its sacramental

polity and liturgy, and its Calvinistic doctrine. Distinction must be made, then, between the Anglican modification of High Calvinist dogma, which was the real root and core of English Arminianism, and the later rationalistic impulse from the Continent which helped form the Latitudinarian element in the Church of England, as well as the theological background for the Cambridge Platonists.

Although Arminianism in England has been almost uniformly thought of as a reactionary movement tending toward Rome, and as an anti-democratic social force, the English Arminians themselves always conceived of their primary mission as opposition to Rome, of defining their own individuality, and Professor A. S. P. Woodhouse has pointed out that Arminianism "undermines the most formidable of the barriers separating Puritanism from democracy."

The term itself is late and its first use represents the time when the split in the English Church reaches the point where the Civil War is inevitable, when the disagreements between the parties in the Church is admitted to involve primarily doctrine and not discipline only. The best date that can be given for its coming to power is, of course, that of the accession of Laud to the Primacy. But its organization as a party had been in preparation before this. In 1615, for instance, someone succeeded in having the High Calvinist catechism removed from the authorized printings of the Bible. The changes and expansions which Robert Burton introduces into the successive editions of the Anatomy of Melancholy are a good index of the growth of this counterattack on High Calvinism.

The fact is that the Elizabethan Church was Calvinist, but not High Calvinist to the extent that theologians like Whitaker and Perkins wanted it to be. In the beginning, discipline, not doctrine, was the center of discussion. But the question of a basic split on doctrine came up earlier than has been generally assumed, and the Church made its choice of a liberal theology and a modified dogma, after the quarrel precipitated by the High Calvinists over the teachings of Peter Baro, a French émigré at Cambridge, in the years between 1579 and 1595. It is apparent that this quarrel was deliberately precipitated by the Puritan party to bring the orthodox Calvinist theologians in on their side in their general campaign against the Church, after their first efforts had been discredited by the Marprelate Tracts. It is also apparent, from the comparison I have made of his utterances before the writing of his Polity with the work of Baro, that Richard Hooker was a member of this Arminian party which took shape as a result of this quarrel, even though it tried its best, under Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall, not to be a party at all.

The Lambeth Articles resulted from the attack made upon Peter Baro for the doctrine of freedom of the will he incorporated into his teaching as Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge, in his book In Ionam Prophetam Praelectiones xxxix (1579) and in his later books, all of which I have considered in this thesis. The drive against Baro and his friends at Cambridge began in the prosecution and disbarment from his degree of one William Barrett of Caius College, and spread rapidly to the attempt to add a set of nine High Calvinist dogmas to the Thirty-Nine Articles as the definition of orthodoxy for the Church of England. These Lambeth Articles have been usually cited to show that Whitgift and the Church of England at the time were High Calvinist in doctrine, but the fact is that the articles that were first put forward by the High Calvinists under Whitaker were modified considerably by Whitgift and Andrewes before they were sent down to Cambridge. They were accepted by Baro himself at first, but he soon rebelled at the interpretation which the High Calvinists put on them and attempted to force upon the doctrines of the Church. I have established the fact that Lancelot Andrewes was a member of the group that modified the Articles and also that he later disapproved of their being considered as Anglican doctrine in the way they were interpreted by the High Calvinists. It also seems well authenticated that the Lambeth Articles were suppressed and made inoperative by the direct action of the Queen.

The issue on which the dispute flared up was, at the beginning, that of the indefectibility of faith in the elect. It also included the question of free-will and predestination, a problem which the Arminians resolved in a rational way by the doctrine of praevisa fide, without, however, abandoning their approval of dogma as such, or their belief in a limited predestination doctrine. The evidence indicates that the modification of High Calvinism by the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace may well be traced to this attack upon High

Calvinism from English sources. Perkins, who is generally credited with originating it, was concerned in the battle from the beginning.

English and Dutch Arminianism probably first came together in the visit of Hugo Grotius to England in 1613 to seek the support of the English Church and of King James for the side of the Dutch Remonstrants in the struggle against the High Calvinists in Holland. I have felt it justified to deduce that it was from this time that the English Arminians became conscious of themselves as a party, and conscious also of the impossibility of sharing the Church with the High Calvinists who used the Remonstrant quarrel in Holland and James' assent to English participation in the Synod of Dort to attempt to turn the English Church entirely away from its traditional forms and functions.

James had interfered early in the Dutch quarrel and had bitterly attacked the appointment of Vorstius to the chair of theology at Leyden to succeed Arminius. James had been persuaded to reverse himself in his condemnation of the Arminians a few weeks before Grotius arrived in England, but Grotius persuaded the King of the rightness of his action, and gained considerable prestige with the King, with Casaubon (through whom he had met James) and with Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall. However, through Archbishop Abbot's efforts against him, Grotius' mission was eventually a failure. Abbot was able to frighten Andrewes out of any support of Grotius, although Overall remained Grotius' firm supporter and friend. The biggest reason for his failure, however, was the fact that on his return to Holland, Grotius permanently alienated James by his publication of his Ordinum Hollandiae which associated the Remonstrants with statements which Grotius had explicitly disavowed to James. This led directly to the loss of the Remonstrants' cause, to the exile of Grotius, and the death of Oldenbarnevelt.

I finish by examining in a preliminary way the relationship of the Arminian reinvigoration of the sacramental concept of the church (and the free-will theology that accompanied it) to the course of the literature, especially the poetry, in England at the time. It seems apparent that the reconstitution of the religious symbol which Arminianism represented had much to do with the renascence of religious poetry of high quality represented by Donne and Herbert, and later by Crashawe, Vaughan, and others. In connection with this latter consideration, I examine the relationship of theology and literature in general. It is apparent not only that for the seventeenth century theology embodies more of the real explanation of the elements of art than philosophy or social event, but also that in general a sacramental concept of symbol is necessary to the production of real art in literature.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

CHAPTER ONE	INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER TWO	DEFINITIONS OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISM
CHAPTER THREE	THE INGREDIENTS OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISM
CHAPTER FOUR	THE LAMBETH ARTICLES
CHAPTER FIVE	ENGLISH AND DUTCH ARMINIANISM
CHAPTER SIX	HUGO GROTIUS AND ENGLISH ARMINIANISM
CHAPTER SEVEN	LITERATURE AND THEOLOGY

STUDIES IN THE ORIGINS OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

PREFACE

I enter here upon the grounds of a very old argument. It is the century-long quarrel about the basic doctrine of the Church of England, and the direction of interpretation the Thirty-Nine Articles should take, especially those concerned with predestination. The whole course of this thesis might well be to review the terms and course of the Quinquarticular Controversy, as it came to be called when Peter Heylyn and Henry Hickman joined in it after the Civil War. Its beginning is usually said to be in 1625, in the uproar which ensued upon the publication of Richard Montague's Appello Caesarem, but even at that time it was only the outbreak into political terms of a theological struggle which had been going on in the Church since Elizabeth's day. During the course of the controversy the same series of charges, counter-charges, assertions, and confutations are canvassed and re-canvassed. There is no profit in reviewing them. By the time of the Restoration the argument is of theological importance alone, for the issues have, by common consent, and by the changes induced by the war, moved beyond the old grounds.

While it lasts, however, the Arminian question holds the sum of the religious issues which lead to the outbreak of the war. And it is an index of developments, during its time of influence on fields other than political, which carry its significance into questions of the whole culture of seventeenth-century England. This study may perhaps best be introduced as a sort of gloss on the following statement in Professor A.S.P. Woodhouse's Introduction to his *Puritanism and Liberty*:

> Most significant of all [the reactions against Puritan dogma] is the reaction against the Calvinistic dogma of predestination as that dogma is set forth by Prynne and others. The reaction, which extends far beyond the ranks of the Puritans, represents a shift towards a rational theology and a humanistic, even a humanitarian, religion. As the Cambridge Platonists were to demonstrate, Arminianism was preeminently the doctrine of Christian rationalism and Christian humanism, re-reading the stern pronouncements of the Reformation in the mellow light of the Renaissance. The Calvinists were quick to point out its affinities with the Pelagian heresy, whose effect was to eliminate divine grace and substitute a gospel of self-help. This is a gospel comfortable to human nature (All men, said Culverwel, are naturally born Pelagians), and one whose role in the making of the modern mind is self-evident. It is not surprising then to find some of the sectaries going far beyond the Arminian position proper, hinting the sufficiency and the natural goodness of human nature and calling in question the doctrine of original sin. But apart from these dubious inferences, and by its central attack on the extreme form of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, of absolute election, and reprobation, Arminianism weakens the theological basis of Puritan *ine*qualitarianism, of the conception of an aristocracy of the elect, and thus undermines the most formidable of the barriers separating Puritanism from democracy. 1

This is probably the best statement that can be found of the function of theological, doctrinal Arminianism in the currents of seventeenth-century development, in so far, that is, as this effect came from the Puritan side. As such, this influence finds its source largely in Dutch Arminianism. But this final accomplishment comes not only out of a shift toward a rational theology, although that

---

1 *Puritanism and Liberty*, London, 1938, p. [54].

impulse provides the final impetus. The doctrine of predestination had been strongly modified first of all within the bounds of the Church of England at the end of the sixteenth century, some years before the modification which began in the Netherlands. Its growing success was one of the elements which precipitated the Civil War, before the rationalist impulse from Dutch Arminianism had had much effect in England. What I intend is an examination of some of the terms of that distinctively English Arminianism as a preface to a re-examination and re-evaluation of two of the periods when the quarrel came into the open: the events leading to the Lambeth Articles of 1595, and the issues surrounding the visit of Grotius to England in 1613. I have examined the works of Peter Baro, about whom the controversy raged in 1595, and those of John Overall and Lancelot Andrewes, and their positions and actions in the affair. One of the things I have discovered is that there is no doubt that Richard Hooker was a member of this doctrinal party, and that he was being attacked for the same heresies as Peter Baro, and at the same time. Examination of the Lambeth Articles has also revealed that, far from being the extreme form of Calvinist dogma, they actually represent a modified form of the dogmatic assertions proposed by the High Calvinists. The circumstances surrounding the Articles also reveal that there was a doctrinal side to the Puritan-Anglican quarrel in its early stages in the 1590's, the terms of which have been generally ignored. The facts surrounding the visit of Grotius to England reveal the true state of the relative positions of English and Dutch Arminianism at the time, and serve, I believe, to decide how much truth there was in the Puritan accusation that the Established Church was following Arminius. The sum of my work leads me to conclude that the rationalist impulses of Continental philosophy have been overestimated in their effect on events in England. English Arminianism was by itself capable of revising Calvinism. Dogmatic theology is the essence of Puritanism; the threat to the Puritan's theological position not only had a great part in precipitating the war, but its development also finally took the issues of the peace out of their hands. It was a modified Calvinism which carried the war to a successful conclusion. The factors which were to make these events and issues were more characteristically English and Anglican, less Continental and rationalistic, than is generally thought.

What I have here accomplished can be regarded as only the beginning of a full study of English Arminianism, but I believe it redresses the terms and proportions of the usual historical estimates in a way that has been needed.

I have also tried, in conclusion, to make some application of my historical findings to a consideration of the relationship of theology and literary art in the early seventeenth century. Specifically I mean the phenomenon of the new kind of religious poetry of a very high quality which appears in the second and third decades of the seventeenth century. I think, that is, that the historical chapters of this study define the terms of change in the dominating theology of the time which accompanied and guided this change in quality. For just one example: it has always been a problem of literary history to decide on the grounds of Donne's conversion and his willingness, with a background of Roman Catholicism such as his, to take Anglican orders. My study suggests that it was not so much Donne who came round to the Anglican position, as it was that the Anglican position came round to the point where a mind such as Donne's could accept it, and, more important, that it could become the material of his particular kind of poetry.

I must emphasize again the preliminary nature of my treatment of this last subject. My conclusions from the thesis as a whole are those of fact and interpretation. It must remain for later development of these facts to formulate broader statements regarding the history and transformation of seventeenth-century English literature.

It remains to express my thanks to those who have helped me to carry out this study: to Professor Douglas Bush who suggested the topic, for the confidence that suggestion implied, and for his patient dealing with the ebullient flights of theory to which I have been addicted; to the staff of the William Allen Neilson Library at Smith College for their patient help in assembling books and to former President Herbert John Davis of Smith for the use of his collection of seventeenth-century editions of Burton; to Dr. Nadine W. Overall of Missouri Valley College

for introducing me to her doctoral thesis on John Overall; and to Professor Albert E. Hyma of the Department of History at the University of Michigan, who generously put at my disposal in manuscript the results of his long research on the life of Grotius which tapped resources which would otherwise have been out of my reach. The writing of this thesis would, of course, have been an impossible task without the resources of the Houghton Library at Harvard, and of the McAlpin Collection at Union Theological Seminary where I received the kindest possible cooperation. Not least I must thank my wife, who has had nothing to do with the writing of this thesis except to create the surroundings and atmosphere in which alone it could be undertaken and written in the midst of many other demands.

CHAPTER ONE

English Arminianism may perhaps be most concisely described in its later stages as the doctrinal, and therefore political, dimension of Anglicanism at one period of history. The definition and isolation of its terms have varied with the focus of each historian who has used it. In fact, it seems to assume a wholly different form in each attempt at definition, according as it is used (and as it can well be used) to refer to a theological, a political, or a social dimension of English seventeenth-century culture.

Defined politically, it denotes for most modern historians, as for example Mr. Trevor-Roper in his life of Laud,[1] merely another and particularly odious political party, intent only upon despotic political power. Defined theologically, as by Dr. A. W. Harrison,[2] it becomes only the English manifestation of a revolution in theological doctrine which began in the Netherlands in the late sixteenth century, and was sui generis[3] in England, without any other cultural or intellectual roots than the usual "historical influences".

---

[1] H.R. Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud, London, 1940.

[2] The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort, London, 1926; Arminianism, London, 1937.

[3] One of the questions which Dr. Harrison leaves unanswered, the answer to which it is one of my principal purposes to ascertain, is to what extent Dutch Arminianism influenced the English theological and political movement. My conclusion is that the English movement is prior and based on quite different grounds, so different that the mission of Grotius to England fails because the English party honestly cannot recognize that they have enough in common with the Dutch to do anything to save the Remonstrant cause in Holland.

Defined again theologically, with a difference, in terms of the consistent, onward, and inevitable progress of the secular idea of toleration, it does not even deserve the name for Professor Jordan,[1] who prefers the term "Anglo-Catholic". And it is merely an early form of, and a political term for, a beneficent and triumphant rationalism for Tulloch.[2]

The studies which follow do not pretend even to begin any full or consistent analysis of what English Arminianism became in its operation as a political party under Laud. There is first of all an investigation of the substance of English Arminianism in its beginnings, and its place in the currents of thought of the time, some investigation of the relationship of Arminianism in the Netherlands and England, all as a preliminary to the detailed study of a series of events at two periods in English history which determined the shape and direction of English Arminianism. The detailed history of that party after Laud took over its leadership must remain for later and fuller treatment. My subject is the theological development which made and shaped the course of subsequent events. It is what Mark Pattison refers to when he says:

---

[1] W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, four volumes, vol. II, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, pp. 115 ff.

[2] John Tulloch, Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century, two volumes, Edinburgh, London, New York, 1872.

> The change of face which English theology effected in the reign of James I is, to our generation, one of the best known facts in the history of our church. But it is often taken for granted that this revolution was brought about by the ascendancy of one man, whose name is often used to denominate the school as the Laudian school of divines. Laud was the political leader, but in this capacity only the agent of a mode of thinking which he did not invent. 1

Professor Bush has said:

> While the original meaning of 'Arminian' was theological...the word became for Puritans the odious label of the High Church and royalist party. 2

It must be emphasized that the term did not in its subsequent development lose its theological content. From the point of view of the political and social historian it is unfortunate, perhaps, that the word first struck off by the Puritans in political heat should have served to link the English form of doctrinal revolt from Calvin with that doctrinal revolution in the Low Countries to which Jacobus Arminius gave his name. Yet from a wider and deeper point of view I must conclude that the Puritans were closer to the kernel of the problem than many later historians, in that they insisted upon the priority of the doctrinal and theological in the political movement they denominated as "Arminian", although (as I shall demonstrate) they were wrong in implying that it was an importation. For them and for their time the theological mode was prior and pervasive for channeling, expressing, and explaining human

---

1 Isaac Casaubon, London, 1875, p. 299.
2 Douglas Bush, English Literature in the Early Seventeenth Century, Oxford, 1945, p. 320.

action and thought.

My immediate purpose here, then, is to lay the groundwork for establishing the essential continuity of English Arminianism, in the political sense of the Laudian royalist party, with the traditional theological forerunners in the English Church whom they professed to be following. In short, it is to establish that the roots of English Arminianism are peculiarly English. My deeper purpose is to take the theological modes of thought and sensibility of the time, as manifested in two historical events, and make some beginning toward a more consistent explanation than has yet been offered of the new mode of poetry which begins to be written in Jacobean England. The important thing is not so much that more of this poetry begins to be religious poetry as that it begins to be religious poetry of a new type.

The development of English Arminianism may be divided into three chronological phases: the intellectual, the ecclesiastical, and the political. In each phase, of course, all three elements are present; I denominate them thus only to distinguish what I consider the predominant motif in each period.

The beginnings of English Arminianism, I find, are in a predominantly intellectual movement: that modification of High Calvinism and especially its doctrine of Absolute Predestination which took place in the University of Cambridge in the 1580's and 1590's under Peter Baro, John Overall, and Lancelot Andrewes, and later at Oxford under Laud, Buckeridge and others. This was a modification so overtly intellectual and doctrinal, and as such (though only in that sense) so similar to the terms which the reaction to High Calvinism was to assume later in the Low Countries, that to my mind it justifies the use of a primarily theological term for the whole movement.[1]

Second comes the ecclesiastical phase during which the Establishment found in this modification of doctrine a more satisfying fabric of justification than the _ad hoc_ arguments which had been forced upon Whitgift in his first duels with Cartwright. It was no accident that the first gun of the skirmish that brought Richard Hooker into the main operations of the Puritan controversy was Travers' accusation that Hooker was modifying the doctrine of predestination in his sermons at the Temple. It is after this phase that English Arminianism begins to acquire the High Church characteristics which were to become its hallmark.

The battle on theological grounds so sharpens between 1603 and 1615 that both sides come to realize that their respective existence, and the future of the English Church, depend upon their capture of political supremacy. It seems obvious to me that it is the Puritans who press this issue, and that the Arminians make their bid for political power only after it has been demonstrated by the maneuverings prefatory to the Synod of Dort that they must attain political power if they are to survive at all. In this last, political phase, the Puritans come to realize that doctrinal differences have grown into an identification of this Arminianism with the whole form and tendency of government and that they have been left no recourse but war to regain a position in which they can carry out politically the implications of their own doctrine and its polity.[1] It is only in the early part of this last period that we have the first use of the terms "Arminian" and "Arminianism" to denote English men and parties. It is with the intellectual and doctrinal preface to its use that I am here mainly to concern myself.

---

[1] It may well be claimed that the essential elements of the concept of the Church which remained from before the English Reformation led to the liberalization of doctrine with which I begin this analysis. In beginning my research I had thought to find this insistence on the sacramental church as the origin of the doctrinal change, but after reading all the works of Baro and Overall, I am convinced that the intellectual element is prior. It might well have died a-borning had not the sacramentalists like Andrewes and Laud, and the ecclesiastics like Bancroft taken it up, but the fact is that while in Hooker (who is, of course, a strong influence, if a somewhat later one) much of the modification of doctrine (though not all, as I shall demonstrate later) is a result of his defence of the Church as Elizabethan political theory would have it be, in the writings of Baro and Overall and the early Andrewes the church is not central; ideas are.

Professor Knappen, in commenting on terminology in his history of Tudor Puritanism,[2] recalls Hooker's dictum that a thing must exist before it can be named. English Arminianism was in existence long before its naming, and its naming was in many ways inaccurate. But its nature, not its naming, should be the object of scholarship. It is my thesis that as certainly as Richard Baxter can be called a Puritan as well as John Rainolds, Richard Hooker can be called an Arminian as well as William Laud. The same process of extension and sharpening which has been applied to Puritanism as a term is long overdue for its great opposite in the central division of the seventeenth century.

---

[1] I may say at the beginning that this thesis is not in any sense for the purpose of whitewashing or attempting to explain away the self-seeking scramble for power engaged in by such bishops as Neile and Montague, nor the moral lapses of the Court, which Bilson and even Andrewes assented to, as in the Essex divorce case, nor the narrow conception of conformity and political power which Laud espoused. It is for the ultimate purpose of investigating from another position than has been usual the climate of feeling which the new theology in the English Church promoted, because it seems conclusive that that theological change coincided with a new alignment of sensibility manifested in a new orientation of literature.

[2] M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, Chicago, 1939, Appendix II, pp. 487-493.

The Whig view of history saw English Arminianism as that party which under the direction of Laud seized control of the Church and its offices late in the reign of James I, and under Charles I allied itself so closely with the crown in its assault on English liberties that it precipitated the Civil War, practically by its own efforts. This movement is almost always accused of being "dogmatic"[1], and since it was attacked by the Puritans, who also raised the issues of constitutional freedom against royal tyranny, the easy conclusion was that Arminianism was also intellectually tyrannical.[1] Being High Church, and with tendencies toward Roman Catholicism, it must by definition be completely opposed to all the liberal tendencies of the time. Since modern liberalism is anti-dogmatic, its sources must be the same, and the opponents of its ancestors must thus have been strongly dogmatic. Thus runs the reasoning.

---

[1] A typical statement is this one from David Mathew's The Jacobean Age, London, 1938, p. 93. "A great mass of the Elizabethans had freed themselves from the conception of an Universal Church and their children were in no mood to accept an authoritative interpretation of Christian teaching. The Laudian divines were to arouse the same hostility as Rome not by any means on account of ceremonies but because of the traditionalist and dogmatic element in their religious ethos." This statement ignores the fact that it was the Puritans who pushed dogma, and the Arminians who were interested in relaxing it. Compare Professor Woodhouse's view of Anglican dogmatism. He says (Puritanism and Liberty, page [38]): "Yet, despite some common ground, the distinction between the Anglican and Puritan mind is valid; for Anglican dogmatism was continually moderated by the tradition of Hooker, with his appeal to philosophy and history to supplement and correct a reliance on the bare letter of the scripture."

The fact is, of course, that in the final issue of war, this party attracted to its standard of 'reaction' most of the 'liberal' elements in England, notably the Latitudinarians, in whom, as we have been advised by Tulloch and Jordan and a host of others, the tradition of toleration and intellectual freedom began. This fact has been brushed off as representing the victory in these men's minds of a basic loyalty to tradition over the temporary radical demand for reform.[2] But in the case of others of the circle at Great Tew, notably Chillingworth and Hales, it is a fact that their alliance with Laud was a longstanding and, it seems, to them a natural one. The facts of this alliance have been brought out convincingly by Robert M. Krapp.[1] His explanation, which is in terms of economics and political history, is adequate for the period which his study embraces. But the rationale of the alliance he documents really lies farther back in the development of Anglicanism. The direct treatment of this question is beyond the scope of this thesis, but my re-examination of the issues involved in the growth of Arminianism will, I believe, clear the ground upon which conclusions involving a larger part of the culture of the time than economic and social issues alone may eventually be based.

---

[1] See Robert M. Krapp, Liberal Anglicanism, 1636-1647, Ridgefield, Conn., 1944. He concludes that Laud was tolerant in matters of intellectual belief, though intolerant in matters of outward ecclesiastical discipline, and he offers conclusive proof of this contention in the facts of Laud's approval and patronage of Chillingworth and Hales, even when they were writing things with which he fundamentally disagreed.

[2] In the case of Falkland. This is the view of Professor Kenneth B. Murdock, The Sun at Noon, New York, 1939.

It has always been recognized that the Anglican tendency toward High Church theology was accompanied in the seventeenth century by a tendency equally strong toward rationalism, two things in our day seemingly incompatible. Tulloch did not make the mistake of the earlier historians and call it simply Romanist. "The movement," he says, "has in itself both a distinct dogmatic and historical life, and is not to be identified with Romanism, even if it be true that its principles lead thither when pushed to their logical consequences."[2] This fact, however, remains a paradox when the whole problem is treated from the standpoint of progress in the development of religious doctrine going hand-in-hand with political progress, both embodying progress toward a terminal and complete rationalism. Tulloch put it thus:

---

[1] Liberal Anglicanism.

[2] Rational Theology, I, 62.

> And if, on the one hand, Anglo-Catholicism has sometimes inclined to Romanism, it has also - and never more strongly than in the seventeenth century - shown an inclination toward liberalism. This is one of the strange anomalies with which we meet in religious developments. Puritanism, which began in impulses of liberty, and which, through all its history, has been so associated with assertion of political independence and rights of conscience, has yet always been intolerant of dogmatic differences. In the seventeenth century it manifested this intolerance in an extreme degree. From no quarter did the liberal theological spirit receive more discountenance, or more fervid denunciation and resistance. On the other hand, the High Church party, while servile in spirit and tyrannic in the exercise of constituted authority, is found - and eminently so in the case of its most notable representative - extending patronage to the earliest of our rational theologians. All these theologians came out of the bosom of the party, and continued, more or less, closely associated with it ....So that if Romanism may be said to lie in wait for Anglo-Catholicism on one side, there is a sense in which Latitudinarianism springs from it on another. 1

The establishment of the terms of development of Anglican doctrine and dogma without rationalistic predispositions either political or theological will, I believe, render this paradox less anomalous. And we need not resort to the limited and distorted terms of economic history alone, a resort which is the weakness of Dr. Krapp's thesis. The principles on which Anglican theological development take place, the principles of the growth of Arminianism in doctrine and institutions, make the alliance of Anglo-Catholicism and Latitudinarianism explicable, if not inevitable. But the terms in which they are examined must be broader than we

---

1 *Ibid*., pp. 63-64.

have used in the past. They are terms which can include the arts and religion in history as they are, and not merely as surrogates for economic or class interests (the 'real' issues behind the facades of ideology) on the one hand, or for contemporary preconceptions on the other.

Any consideration of Arminianism must begin with some attention to the relation of doctrine and dogma to history. Most of the categories in which the mass of men, and the exceptions to the mass as well, lived and thought and felt in the seventeenth century were religious, and more than that, theological. In the last century, Weber and Troeltsch, alarmed by the narrowness of the Marxist-materialist theory and writing of history, produced their studies of Puritanism in an effort to prove the direct relation of dogma and event.[1] Their method and conclusions have been considerably refined since, notably by Tawney,[2] but the conclusion must be that, although doctrine and dogma cannot be denied a part in the texture of action of men in society, that relationship certainly is neither constant, nor direct, nor rational, and certainly cannot be directly connected with the growth of capitalism in the sense of cause and effect.[1]

---

[1] Max Weber, Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie, Vol. I, Tübingen, 1920-1921. Translated by Talcott Parsons, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, London, 1930.
Ernst Troeltsch, Die Soziallehren der Kristlichen Kirchen und Gruppen, Gesammelte Schriften, Vol. I, four volumes, Tübingen, 1912-1925. Translated by Olive Wyon, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, two volumes, London, 1931.

[2] R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, Pelican Books, New York, 1947.

That the relation of doctrine and character, dogma and institution, is not direct is, however, no reason for abandoning all thought of any connection whatever between them. Certainly the doctrine of predestination cannot be ignored in discussing the Puritan movement. Historians now agree that this doctrine did not act as it is thought a deterministic philosophy ought to act, on the springs of individual or social action of these men. Professor Knappen remarks[2] on the fact that there is little trace of a sense of anything but complete freedom of the will in the minds of the two Puritan diarists he edited. And yet the threat to the orthodox doctrine of High Calvinism as the guiding theology of the Church of England was among the most important causes of the war, and it is remarkable that a seemingly deterministic theology could spur these men on to the most incredible energies, to behead kings, remake societies and plant new ones. These energies rise and fall with the power of the doctrine of predestination. Professor Jordan puts it directly that:

---

[1] Professor Knappen concludes after his editing of Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries (Chicago, American Society of Church History, 1933, p. 10), that Weber and Troeltsch "...exaggerated the role of theological dogma in the formation of human character." Professor Harold Laski (The Rise of Liberalism, New York, 1936, p. 34) concludes that "Weber and his disciples have committed a grave anachronism in their eagerness to prove a theory." Preserved Smith (A History of Modern Culture, New York, 1930, pp. 375 ff.) notes that predestination was central to Puritan theology, but warns also that "This doctrine... has been often misunderstood, as if it were a philosophical theory of determinism."
See also H. M. Robertson, Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism: A Criticism of Max Weber and his School, Cambridge, 1933. Closer to the particular field of my interest is Professor Albert Hyma's article, "Calvinism and Capitalism in the Netherlands, 1555-1700", The Journal of Modern History, X (1938), 321-343, in which he offers a refutation of Weber based on the interplay of Arminian and Calvinist in the economic life of the Netherlands. He points out that Weber ignored the fact that the Arminians in the Netherlands outstripped the Calvinist areas economically.

[2] Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, p. 15.

> ...the doctrine of predestination formed the central pillar of the Calvinistic dogmatic system. Correctness on this doctrine became a symbol of orthodoxy....it should be observed that directly confidence had been destroyed in this mainspring of the Calvinistic system, the power and militancy of Protestantism came to an abrupt end. [1]

And Professor Woodhouse finds in dogma the one characteristic that binds together all types of Puritans, as late as the period of 1645-1650.[2]

There is a real relationship, then, between the forms of this dogma and doctrine and the social phenomena which men imbued with such a belief produce, although it is in no sense direct or logical. The growth and decline of the doctrine of predestination moreover, has much to do with the other side of the great theological dichotomy of the seventeenth century, the Anglican. And it is also my belief that the study of this doctrine and its course will throw light also on the relationship of theology with cultural productions such as art and literature. Thus a study such as this thesis undertakes, of the breakdown of the power of the doctrine of predestination, and of the assumptions of the dogmatic form it assumed, by a consideration and analysis of some of the events and forces which broke it down, should, in the end, give a more comprehensive key to the wider dichotomy which divided some whose theologies agreed. This is to portray in basic terms the essential opposition between Puritan and Anglican, and to contribute to a closer knowledge of their differences of temper and sensibility. These are the elements which produced our modern world, its institutions and political arrangements. It is far past the time when we could say that one of these parties was necessarily the party of the future, the other of the past. It is even farther past the time when we could say that all the best elements of both were preserved to make the future. We have lived too closely with that future!

---

[1] The Development of Religious Toleration in England, II, 324.
[2] Puritanism and Liberty, pp. [39] ff.

There have been due warnings for many years about the importance of religion in the life of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. "So all-important", says Hardin Craig, "was the subject of religion in every department of Renaissance life, that those who seek to know the sources of Elizabethan thought must turn to it."[1] R. H. Tawney says of the sixteenth century: "The first fundamental assumption which is taken over by the sixteenth century is that the ultimate standard of human institutions and activities is religion."[1] With the end of the Renaissance there is, if anything, an increasing emphasis on theology in England.[2] But it is well also to consider what Professor Louis B. Wright adds: "To say that the history of religion is one of the most important, as well as one of the most complex, subjects facing the student of the English Renaissance is a platitude so obvious that it ought not to need repeating. Yet of all the fields of investigation in the history of English thought during this period, it would be hard to find another that has been treated in such piecemeal fashion, or approached with so many preconceived and ex parte notions."[3]

---

[1] The Enchanted Glass, Oxford, 1936, p. 49. H. O. Wakeman puts it thus: (The Church and the Puritans, 1570-1660, London, 1887, p. 85.) "This intimate connection between politics and religion is the essential characteristic of the history of England during the seventeenth century. It is impossible to understand the controversies of the day unless their double character is always borne in mind."

It has been said that the most important principle of philosophy is that "The way a question is asked limits and disposes the ways in which an answer to it - right or wrong - may be given."[4] The way the questions of the seventeenth century were asked was religious; from the religious questions issued the political and social ones, and that priority was important. The skeptical thought of Machiavelli and Montaigne was becoming increasingly strong in its influence but it had not yet really shaken the supports of the traditional web of questions under which society operated. That change was to come with some speed, but the old terms were to hold on in more than name alone. It is significant that the word Arminian, the content of which was so purely doctrinal, was at the same time so completely political for the first twenty-five years of its use. Church polity was politics under Elizabeth; there was no political division on doctrine. Doctrine and polity, in that order, are politics under James and Charles. The fact that we must begin with is that the habit of mind of the early seventeenth century was such that the ideas of the time had to be in terms of a world-scheme (which, indeed, is also true of the Middle Ages and the sixteenth century) and had to be expressed in theology (and the dominance of theological terms is the outstanding characteristic of the first half of the seventeenth century).

---

[1] Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, p. 25.

[2] See Pattison's Isaac Casaubon, pp. 321 ff. Professor Woodhouse says: (Puritanism and Liberty, p. [38]) "The first feature of the Puritan mind to strike a reader of the Debates is the dominant place held in it by dogmatic religion, and the tendency to carry inference from dogma into secular life. It is true that this character is peculiar to the Puritan rather in degree than in kind. Grotius observed the addiction of the English as a nation to theology; and with certain notable exceptions (Hobbes, Harrington, Selden), the cast of its political thinking in the first half of the seventeenth century is definitely theological."

[3] "The Significance of Religious Writings in the English Renaissance", Journal of the History of Ideas, I (1940), pp. 59-68.

[4] Suzanne Langer, Philosophy in a New Key, Penguin Books, New York, 1948, p. 1.

I must, then, try to establish some truths about the relationship of theology and theological doctrine and dogma to institutions, as that relationship can be seen to be working out in the seventeenth century, for the content and history of the term with which I am to deal is essentially the history of the changing relationship between the institution of the English Church and its society and culture.

The contemporary view was simple. Institutions, whether political or ecclesiastical, were the chosen instruments of God to embody doctrine upon earth. Pragmatically, however, we can see that theological doctrines may be the results of institutions creating intellectual and emotional justifications for themselves, or (when these doctrines are intellectual constructs from other doctrines which have outworn their institutions) they may themselves be formers of institutions. There is no doubt that where they affect history, doctrines work through institutions. The doctrine of predestination is central to, and produces, the Calvinistic concept of the Church. There is no possibility of accounting for the doctrine directly on social and economic grounds. The concept of the Church is the determining factor in the political theory of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century battles. The real Church for the Calvinist was the Church Invisible, the body of the Elect, and it had to be at least left uncontrolled by the state if it was to carry out the will of God. It would, the Calvinist felt, be even better if the state too were an instrument of the Church. Its demand for control of the state was the result of its feeling that only in this way could it be truly and completely the Church of God.[1] The line from abstract doctrine, then, is to this extent direct. In Calvinism the institution is the manifestation of an essentially abstract doctrine, an intellectual construct. It comes into violent contact in England with a Church which, in the movement of social and political forces, and to save its own character and political function, is engaged in modifying the terms of Calvinist doctrine. That is, the doctrine seeking to modify the Church runs head-on into the Church which is seeking to modify that doctrine.[1] What I intend here is an examination of some aspects of the doctrinal terms of this clash, largely from the Anglican side.

---

[1] See A. C. McGiffert, "Calvin's Theory of the Church" in Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects...Testimonial to C. A. Briggs, New York, 1911, pp. 207-226. Also John T. McNeill, "The Church in Post-Reformation Reformed Theology", The Journal of Religion, XXIV (1944), pp. 96-107.

It would be a mistake to treat theological doctrine as nothing more than a convenient form of the expression of the philosophy of the seventeenth century. That would be to oversimplify the true complexity of the age. It is true that the systems of the philosophers and the traces of their ideas in the writings of the time are easier to work with, more purely intellectual, less sicklied o'er with the pale cast of institutions, social developments, and the political hurly-burly, but it must be admitted from the evidence of history that the event seeks the philosophy more often than the philosophy shapes the event. It is not in philosophy that we get the complete market of Renaissance and early seventeenth-century ideas in their developing state; it is in the theology, especially (although perhaps for the last time) in the early seventeenth century. Theology is not a philosophic system, not a Weltanschauung, a rationally integrated, deliberate world-system, and it is, I may comment in passing, exactly this fact which makes it especially valuable for examining the real springs of literature and art in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

---

[1] It is interesting that under the same terms of analysis the modern world political crisis shows the clash in similar terms. The Russian state is an intellectual construct from a formulation of doctrine in much the same way as the Calvinistic Church and its theory of the state. It is also international in much the same way, and Protestant scholasticism hardened Calvinism's original tenets into dogmatic extremes in much the same way as Russia is hardening Marxism into dogma to-day. The American philosophy of democracy, on the other hand, is a product of social and historical event: it 'just growed', it seems. The philosophy, as in the case of the New Deal and a hundred other developments of American social history, has come after the event, sometimes long after. American politics has had a habit of leaving its would-be philosophical shapers, like Henry and Brooks Adams, to wither on the vine. The institution of the state has here come before its philosophy. However, as the Russian ideology has hardened into more and more pervasive dogma, the American seems to be becoming dogmatized in much the same way. Likewise in the seventeenth century, as the Puritan insistence on more and more pervasive and rigid dogma grew, it produced an Anglican counter-dogma, rather ritualistic than doctrinal, but dogma nevertheless, which brought in against it the great uncommitted center whose strength was enough to bring it down to ruin.

There is no doubt that the seventeenth century, and the movement that I take as the object of my inquiry, saw an overwhelming slide from theology to philosophy as the terms in which men saw the universe. Theology became philosophy, in fact, almost altogether. It is also true that this process is a part of the whole 'rationalization' of thought which begins with Machiavelli and Montaigne and Bodin, and reaches its height with the philosophy of

Bacon and Descartes; that new habit of mind which sees the center of man's existence in process of mind, and that alone, Professor Laski cites its corresponding form in political thought when he says:

> ...there is a new political theory which, as with Machiavelli and Bodin, makes the relations of man to man, instead of the relations of man with God, the foundations of social inquiry. 1

The relations of man to man require only the discourse of logical reason, and there is no reason, after a while, why the relations of man to God should not also restrict itself to those terms. There were philosophical preparations for this development, but there were also theological ones, and they should be studied from a more clearly theological point of view than philosophical predilections have, until recently, allowed.

Theological doctrine can also be seen as the basis for the seventeenth century of two movements which have largely been seen in other terms, individualism and liberal democracy. We can see, in the first place, the development within a religious framework of an attitude which says that the problems of theology have no absolute answers, that what is right to the individual is right for him. It is, of course, philosophically the result of many factors and original theories, most conveniently to be expressed, perhaps, in the division of faith and reason engineered by Bacon and Descartes, which gave up the asking of great questions in the sphere of faith, for the purpose of ask-

---

1 The Rise of Liberalism, p. 11.

ing more detailed and practical questions in the sphere of reason and matter. It is socially the result of the opening of an era of colonial exploitation and of economic expansion which pragmatically changed the rationalization of human actions to a new set of standards more adapted to the demands of that era. It is the result of the rise of the middle class, perhaps. But this new individualism can also grow out of the doctrine of general grace which was the creation of English Arminianism. We cannot assume that economic factors or social factors lead to the modification of the doctrine of absolute predestination which this new doctrine represents, for the modification is not the work of the class in which the economic and social leaven is working most strongly, although the later application of these ideas in philosophic or political modes may come from them. If God offers grace that saves (not merely sustaining grace) to every human being, not solely to the Elect, then he must have to offer it in such intellectual terms as each human being can accept. This is the logical development from an Arminian theology, not a Calvinist.[1] In breaking down the conception of an aristocracy of the Elect, as Professor Woodhouse says in the passage I have quoted in beginning this thesis, Arminianism "undermines the most formidable of the barriers separating Puritanism from democracy." The fact that the Puritans destroyed the existing frame of government in England by war is not so strange, considering the principles upon which they based their actions. What is strange is that the doctrine in the name of which they overthrew a political despotism, gave way to a philosophy, the legal basis of which (the social compact) had one of its earliest statements in England in the writings of Richard Hooker. And Richard Hooker is not the shy and lonely genius he has been represented; he was saying the same things doctrinally against Calvinism in the 1590's as a considerable party of theologians at Cambridge, the fathers of English Arminianism.

---

[1] The Puritan exaltation of the plain man reading Scripture arrives perhaps at the same end, but the impulse behind it was the conforming of the individual to the Scripture, not the Scripture to the individual.

Professor Woodhouse is referring in the passage I have cited to the Arminianism of the left-wing groups under the Commonwealth, but the same modification of the theology of Calvinism, although not so much in rationalist terms, had taken place among the Anglicans fifty years before. Professor Laski does point out that whatever progressiveness the Puritans later adopted must have come from sources extraneous to Calvinism, but he is almost as ingenuous as Weber in assuming that the whole content of liberalism is secular and philosophic. Had it not come to the English people after the Civil War from the traditional edifice of the established Church and the traditional forms of English society, the left-wing reformers and theorists might have shouted in vain, as, for the accomplishment of most of their program, they did.

There are, then, Arminianisms and Arminianisms. That liberal theology which inspired the rationalist extremists of the Puritan parties, and that Latitudinarianism which led the way to rational religion, may have owed most of the characteristic cast of their theologies, and the course they took later, to the Arminianism of Holland and the Continent. But before Arminius had even begun to be heard from, England had produced her own sturdy revolt against High Calvinism. It is my belief, although I have not the space to argue it in this thesis, that the traditionalist Arminianism was a stronger factor in the making of modern events and institutions than the rationalist. The two streams join in the junction of the Latitudinarians and the Laudian party, but they had much earlier been offered an opportunity to join by Grotius in 1613, and had, in effect, declined. Rationalistic Arminianism had its effect upon literature and the arts, but the earlier English Arminianism was also responsible for a short but intense modification of some elements of the temper and cast of English poetry in the years from 1610 to 1650.

The growth of Arminianism in England is the growth of an attitude toward, and a view of the function of, dogma. It remains to make some general introductory comments on dogma as such, before I proceed to my study of the Lambeth Articles.

It is of some importance in accounting for the revolution in men's attitude toward, and reading of, the universe that took place in the seventeenth century (the revolution that has meant more than anything else in getting us where we are in the modern world) that in 1580 most members of the Church of England would look with horror on the suggestion that a man could be saved with any admixture of his own merit, or any effort of his own will, and that fifty years later such heresy is accepted officially by the Church as the only possible doctrine, and those who oppose it are coming to feel that their backs are against the wall.

It is even more important that at both of these times most of these same Englishmen accepted the fact that each of these doctrines could be immediately embodied in terms to which all men could and should agree, and that they could be defended as a dogma which could be a source of comfort and of power. It took the Civil War to disabuse them of such a trust in dogma. We are ourselves of late becoming aware that some dogma, whether we avow it - or are even aware of its existence - or not, is necessary to any society. Because we had to all intents got rid of religious dogma we have thought that we were rid of all dogma. W. H. Auden has said that "...the religion of a civilized society is distinguished by the existence of dogma as separate from mythology and cult....", and he points out that there is also a dogma, and orthodoxy, in the foundations of even a liberal society, no matter how much that society may hate the very idea of dogma as standing for the inhibition of freedom of ideas and of inquiry.[1] The battle between Arminianism and Puritanism in England was a battle between two formulations of dogma, it is true, but it was also a battle between two concepts of the area and function of dogma. The Calvinist is moving and constantly pressing toward more and more rigid and more and more inclusive dogmas; the Arminian insistence is that, for the sake of peace and right in the Church, the essentials of religion shall be as few as possible, and that dogma shall be restricted to essentials of belief, those things needed for salvation, and those things alone. These were no small stakes. Dr. Krapp has defined the place of dogma for the time thus:

---

[1] In a review of T. S. Eliot's Notes Toward the Definition of Culture, in The New Yorker, April 23, 1949.

> We must remember that in the seventeenth century religious dogma was not thought of by the vast majority of the people as inconvenient or arbitrary. On the contrary, religious dogma was the organized, revealed will of the Almighty God, a true understanding of which gave to its possessors immense powers within their daily lives, in the world. For many men, true belief was a privilege, a key to intellectual certainty such as could be had nowhere else. Somewhat like Science to-day, religion in the seventeenth century was a body of knowledge which included not only men's aspirations, but also the tools and weapons which those aspirations - both worldly and spiritual - might be realized. To take away a man's religious faith was to leave him miserable and weak. 1

T. E. Hulme has said that no humanist can understand dogma,[2] and we are going to see in the recital that follows that there is a certain polarity of the theological and the humanist, but this polarity does not mean that in actual practice a regard for dogma, a belief in its validity, and

---

1 Liberal Anglicanism, p. 92.

2 Speculations, 2d ed., London, 1936, p. 71. He uses the term, of course, in its theological sense.

a desire to preserve it could not be a characteristic of a humanist. The desire to preserve dogma can be behind the humanist's reluctance to extend it too far. A primitive society makes dogma of almost all the activities of human beings; an old and tired society cannot bring itself to believe that anything matters enough to have the force of dogma. Between the two extremes is a considerable area of variation.

As we see it now, dogma becomes, even in its formation, the fossil form of doctrine. Institutions acquire ideologies, or ideologies build institutions, and they attempt to freeze their existence into forms to withstand changes in intellectual climate. The seventeenth century is the beginning of the twilight of dogma as a static principle. The Arminian movement in England has as its central effort an attempt to preserve in principle the existence of dogma, at the same time as they want to make it adaptable to a progressive revelation.

What I am to concentrate upon in what follows is the process which launches the great iceberg of Calvinistic predestination out into the warming seas of the seventeenth century, into the currents which have been named (but not thereby fully defined and described) as "rationalism" and "individualism" and "science". The conclusion I wish to press is that those forces came late. The doctrine itself had already been largely destroyed in England by the time those ideas came into full play, destroyed on its own grounds by theology, but without any attack on the validity of the whole idea of dogma itself. These same doctrines which destroyed absolute predestination were perhaps the theological form of the philosophic ideas which have been given the credit for destroying it. It was perhaps the philosophic ideas which later were to destroy the credit of the whole idea of dogma *per se*. But the work was done by forces which had very little to do with philosophic systems.

My contention here is also that we find in the process of this modification some index to the re-orientation of art and literature which was going on in England at the same time.

I must, however, first be more specific and factual about Arminianism and its manifestations. At the end of my discussion of some aspects of the origins of English Arminianism, I shall sketch the considerations on which I think these studies enter into the history of the literature of the time.

CHAPTER TWO

DEFINITIONS OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

The problem of completely defining English Arminianism is one which goes beyond the limits of this thesis. My purpose here is merely to give the factual basis for eventually establishing the fact that the English and Anglican element in what was called Arminianism in England is stronger than the Dutch and Rationalist element on the one hand, and the Roman Catholic tendency the Puritans saw in it on the other. By the time the terms 'Arminian' and 'Arminianism' come into use in England, they have all the emotional overtones of political polemic which can possibly obscure the true outlines of the object. 'Arminianism' is used to denote a political party, and it is used to imply that a foreign doctrine has infected a group of Englishmen who, by the necessary alliance which a liberal theology has with Popery, are going to corrupt the English state and bring it under foreign dominance. The disturbances in Holland over Arminius and the Remonstrants, which had culminated in the Synod of Dort, and the contemporary flirtation between the monarchy and Spain gave color to the identification which Prynne incorporated with perfect seriousness into the bill of particulars brought against Laud. That these two things had come together in this relationship in the popular mind grew from the fact that the High Calvinism which was by this time the center of Puritanism identified every departure from its extreme tenets as a step toward

Rome. And when political events made them coincide with diplomatic overtures toward the leading Catholic power, there was a theological basis for revolt.

Francis Rous's speech to the House on January 26th, 1629 makes the connection in vivid terms. There is no doubt that this formulation represents one important element in the revolt that led to the war. He claims in beginning that there is a more important subject than the Petition of Right which they have been discussing, a subject which concerns not only 'our goods, liberties, and lives' but 'eternal life, our souls, yea our God himself.'

> And this right, in the name of this Nation, I this day claim, and desire that there may be a deep and serious consideration of the violations of it. I desire first that it may be considered what new paintings are laid upon the old face of the whore of Babylon to make her seem more lovely, and to draw so many suitors to her. I desire that it may be considered how the See of Rome doth eat into our Religion and fret into the banks and walls of it, the laws and statutes of this realm; especially since those laws have been made in a manner by themselves, even by their own treasons and bloody designs, and since their Popery is a confused mass of errors, casting down Kings before Popes, the precepts of God before the traditions of men, living and reasonable men before dead and senseless stocks and stones. I desire that we may consider the increase of Arminianism, an error that maketh the grace of God lackey it after the will of man, that maketh the sheep to keep the shepherd, that maketh mortal seed of an immortal God. Yea, I desire that we may look into the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Roman tyranny and Spanish monarchy. For an Arminian is the spawn of a Papist; and if there come the warmth of favour upon him, you shall see him turn into one of those frogs that rise out of the bottomless pit. And if you mark it well, you shall see an Arminian reaching out his hand to a Papist, a Papist to a Jesuit, a Jesuit gives one hand to the Pope and

> the other to the King of Spain; and these men having kindled a fire in our neighbor country, now they have brought over some of it hither, to set on flame this Kingdom also. 1

Modern historians divide upon the same lines: Professor Jordan would deny to this movement the term Arminian entirely, and call it Anglo-Catholic. Professor Usher rationalizes his feeling that Arminianism is predominantly Roman Catholic by assuming that the Catholic minority forced into the Church under Elizabeth and James brought the Church around to their way of thinking. He says:

> The reaction against the Book of Discipline and dogmatic Calvinism, together with the friendliness to the Catholics and the endeavour to draw as many of them as possible into the Establishment, laid the foundations of that theological movement known as Arminianism, whose first clear traces are found in 1607 and 1608, but whose full fruition was not realized for nearly fifteen years..... Thus it was that in 1608 the presence in the Church of these quasi-Catholics, (if they might be so called) had produced a perceptible influence on its theological beliefs ..... The movement gained its real currency with the clergy and laity because it was the natural expression of a tendency which had already showed great strength on the Continent. Arminianism was the English equivalent of the Counter-Reformation. 2

---

1 Wallace Notestein and Frances Helen Relf, edd., Commons Debates for 1629, University of Minnesota Studies in the Social Sciences No. 10, Minneapolis, 1921, pp. 12-13. John Goodwin said in 1658; "...as the market of reproach and disgrace now ruleth in this angle of the world, call a man an Arminian, and you have called him constructively, yea eminently, Thief, Traitor, Murderer, Heretic, False Prophet, and whatsoever else soundeth infamy or reflection upon men."

2 Roland G. Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church, two volumes, New York, 1910, II, 267-268.

For this conclusion there is actually no evidence at all. It only shows how completely Professor Usher neglected the theological side of the administrative movement he studied so ably, and how much of the Puritan propaganda could seep into the objectivity of the political historian. The fact is that Arminianism contained the English equivalent of the Counter-Reformation at one point in its development, as it also contained the opposite of the Counter-Reformation in the Latitudinarians, but there is another center around which both of these revolve. Professor J. W. Allen also wishes to deny the High Church party the name of Arminian. A neo-Catholic faith was in process of formation, he says, and the term Arminian as applied to the High Church party in England is accurate only in respect of the fact that it arose out of "...a growing inclination to doubt or even to deny altogether the Calvinistic doctrine of grace and predestination."[1] He concludes, however, that "it must, I think, be regarded as by far the most important intellectual and religious movement of the time."[2]

Those who see the events of English history in the light of the development of doctrine see the essence of Arminianism as rationalism; they insist on the primacy of the Latitudinarian element in it, and they assume that the word Arminian is an unerring guide to the definition of what it represents. Ergo it must be the result of Dutch

---

[1] J. W. Allen, English Political Thought, 1603-1660, London, 1938, p. 158.
[2] Page 158.

Arminianism. H. O. Wakeman makes the transition from rationalism to episcopacy thus:

> The Arminian movement, begun under the guidance of philosophy, took shape through the evidence of history, and was enforced upon men as a matter of law..../Its/...strength...was found in its vivid realization of the continuous life of the Church, in its fearless reliance upon history, and in its deep sympathy with man's moral nature. It was soon to show its weakness in the confusion which it brought between spiritual and civil authority. From being an intellectual belief affecting conduct through voluntary conviction, it became a political system enforced by penalties. [1]

John Hunt's Religious Thought in England, and Principal Tulloch's Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England, which I have already cited, represent the fullest development of this emphasis.[2] It seems hard to believe that all these men have consulted the same documents. More recent historians have come to insist on the primacy of the theological content of the term and to distinguish its essentials from Romanism. Godfrey Davies insists that "Arminianism was a protest against the doctrinal tyranny of Calvinism, just as independency was a protest against any closely organized church." And "In England the Arminians were those who rebelled against the intellectual tyranny of

---

[1] The Church and the Puritans 1570-1660, London, 1887, p. 81.
[2] Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of the Last Century, two volumes, London, 1870. Typical of his point of view is his statement that "The Church of England's transition from Calvinism to Arminianism in the time of James and Charles, was one of those inevitable changes which come over every progressive community", which is, of course, merely to beg the question.

Calvinism, especially against predestination..."[1] Professor Haller isolates the Anglican theology "of elastic compromise and continuous adjustment between divine law and human nature" as "...the Arminianism of the church which, along with the antinomianism of the Puritan left wing, ultimately disrupted the ranks of militant orthodox Calvinism."[2]

Whatever it was for the seventeenth-century Puritan, Arminianism for the purposes of defining it to-day has also been confused by theological discriminations from later eras. For the eighteenth century it took on humanitarian implications with the Wesleys which had little except opposition to Calvinism in common with the issues of the seventeenth century. For Newman the 'Arminian' version of justification was one of the things he had against Anglican doctrine. In one of his lectures on the Doctrine of Justification he says:

> [Roman Catholic writers] raise man to the capacity, the latter ~~have~~ reduced him to the necessity, of being justified by his obedience and nothing else. By the latter divines I mean the Arminians who rose in Charles the First's time, and have exercised an extensive influence in our Church since 1688. [3]

---

[1] The Early Stuarts, Oxford, 1945, p. 69 n. He has incorporated here the substance of his article "Arminian versus Puritan in England ca. 1620-1640", Huntington Library Bulletin, V (1934), pp. 157-179.

[2] William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, New York, 1938, p. 21.

[3] John Henry Newman, Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification, London, 1900, p. 182.

The principal difference between seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Arminianism is that the latter abandoned the concept of Original Sin and any semblance of a doctrine of predestination, while the former never let go of either.

I am far from presuming to give a complete history of the content and development of English Arminianism; that, I have come to conclude in working at this study, would involve several volumes and at least a lifetime. I here present what is merely a brief in favor of the continuity of Anglican and Arminian: an investigation of two incidents in the development of Arminianism in England. The result is to strengthen for me first of all the belief that English Arminianism is a predominantly domestic product, and second, that the central tradition of Anglican theology is more strongly present in what Arminianism in England came to be than has been recognized.

Fuller, under the date 1622, marks a point which, as far as I have been able to ascertain, is the earliest use of the word to denote a strictly English phenomenon. He says that the Archbishop of Spalatro, that ill-fated convert to the English Church, who recanted again, and died in the prison of the Inquisition, "...was the first who, professing himself a Protestant, used the word Puritan, to signify the defenders of matters doctrinal in the English church. Formerly the word was only taken to denote such as dissented from the hierarchy in discipline and church government, which now was extended to brand such as were anti-Arminian in their judgments."[1]

It is worth noting that Fuller uses the term 'anti-Arminian' quite naturally, as if 'Arminian' were, at the same period, the natural opposite of 'Puritan'. What is, for him, important is that now the word 'Puritan' is used to denote someone who defends 'matters doctrinal' in the Church. This may be slightly cryptic except in the light of Fuller's Puritan bias, which is larger than most people have realized.[2] The "matters doctrinal" which they defend are the Calvinistic bases of the theology of the Church of England.

What is probably an even earlier use of the word Puritan in the same doctrinal sense, although it cannot be definitely dated, occurs in a manuscript summary by John Overall "De statu questionum quinque inter Remonstrantes et Contra-Remonstrantes Controversarum",[3] in which he gives the basis of the doctrinal positions of each party. The heading of the manuscript indicates that this is not in Overall's hand, but there is no reason to suppose that the use of the word is not his. He says, after a summary of the doctrines of predestination of the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants:

---

[1] Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain, six volumes, Oxford, 1865, ed. J. S. Brewer, Book x, V, p.529.

[2] I shall show below in discussing the Lambeth Articles that Fuller echoes even the phrases of Prynne's Anti-Arminianism in his recital of that event in Church History.

[3] St. John's College MS. H. 15, pages 4-7, reproduced in photostat with the Yale Dissertation of Miss Nadine Webb Overall: John Overall, 1560-1619, typescript, New Haven, 1947. I have been indebted to a considerable extent to the research contained in this thesis for clarification of many of the facts about this prominent figure in my thesis, and to Miss Overall's advice on sources, etc.

> Et haec est sententia Zuingli, Calvini et Puritanorum, ignota omnibus antiquis Patribus, etiam Augustino, et eius sectatoribus: rejecta ab omnibus Pontificiis, et Lutheranis, multisque aliis.

Since Overall died in 1619, it would seem that we have here an earlier use of the term than Spalatro's. If, as we may imagine is likely, Overall wrote this treatise when the disputes between the two parties in the Low Countries first burst into flame, this would date his use of the term before 1610 - which is also before the Bishop of Spalatro came to England.[1]

There is no reason to doubt that the term 'Arminian' first came into England in connection with the political maneuvering in the Netherlands preceding the Synod of Dort.

---

[1] MS. Trinity College Cambridge B.14.9, dealing with the Lambeth Articles, has a letter from Junius to Peter Baro (which I shall discuss more at length in a later chapter) probably written about 1595, although there is no date in the text, which has the notation by the compiler or by someone going through the manuscripts some time in the seventeenth century: "Theses hae cum Arminii animadversionibus editae sunt ad [eadem?] amicae collationis Arminii cum Junio." This would indicate that the quarrel over the Lambeth Articles was regarded as pertinent and related to the issues in Holland. But since it is probable that this was the notation of one of the principals in the Prynne-Heylyn-Hickman-Fuller battle about the middle of the century, I cannot adduce it as an early use of the word 'Arminian' for the English liberals in doctrine.

The letters of Sir Dudley Carleton to his correspondents in England, and letters from them to him, use the term quite naturally, although it does not appear in all the correspondence between Grotius and his English friends, dating from about 1612. For an instance, on September 12, 1617, Carleton writes to John Chamberlain from the Hague that the business of the Synod is doubtful "because of the opposition of the Arminian faction,"[1] and on October 31, 1617, Chamberlain reports to Carleton that he has had some conversation with Bishop Andrewes about "...somewhat you had written touching the Arminians countenancing themselves with some of his letters".[2] And in The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnevelt, which the editor is sure must have been played shortly after the execution of Barnevelt in 1619, the term is applied to the Remonstrants.[3]

Who first applied it to an Englishman is hard to say, and perhaps immaterial. There is little doubt that Grotius' mission to England had as one of its results, as it had it for one of its purposes, to identify the position of the Remonstrants with the theological views of the High Church party in England. The use of the same term for both was then inevitable.[4] It is only with the 1624 edition of The

---

[1] Thomas Birch, ed., The Court and Times of James the First, two volumes, London, 1849, II, p. 31.

[2] Ibid., p.47.

[3] A. H. Bullen, ed., The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnevelt, in volume two of A Collection of Old English Plays, in four volumes, London, 1883, pp. 201-314.

[4] George Roberts, ed., Diary of Walter Yonge Esq., (Camden Society, London, 1848, p. 93) An entry under the year 1626 reads: "Arminianism and Pelagianism do much speed abroad in divers parts of this realm, and many bishops infected therewith."

Anatomy of Melancholy that Burton speaks of "our late Arminian"; in the first edition of 1621, although he mentions Vorstius as calling "God and his attributes into question", he makes no move to connect him with the Remonstrants.[1] I am inclined to think that the Calvinists were provoked to the invention of the term 'Arminian' by the High Church party's taking the offensive in attempting to dissociate the Church of England from the aspersion of being Calvinist. They had, as I shall demonstrate in my section on Grotius' visit to England, good reason for thinking it necessary to take the offensive, but it is apparent from the literature which begins the dispute, notably from Montague's *Appello ad Caesarem*, that the Arminians are attempting to dissociate the Church of England from the doctrines of Calvin when the other side assumes, after the Synod of Dort, that the issue is settled for good. Daniel Featley, in his contribution to the attack on Montague, his *Pelagius Redivivus* of 1626, speaks of the "new found crime, namely of doctrinall Puritanism." Tulloch says of Laud in his *English Puritanism and Its Leaders*:

> He saw at once the meaning and value of the doctrinal change that had begun, and set himself at its head. Although comparatively languid in his own dogmatic sympathies, it was he who invented the name of 'doctrinal Puritanism' to designate the opposition to the Church, and led the reaction against Calvinism. 2

---

1 I shall discuss the changes Burton makes in his editions of the *Anatomy* more at length below.

2 Edinburgh and London, 1861, p. 43. Tulloch in this volume exemplifies the dangers of the easy assumption that the name describes the origin of what it names. He assumes

Prynne's Anti-Arminianisme of 1629 and 1630 ought to be our best source for the history of English Arminianism, but he has very little consistent information to offer. He asserts stoutly that Arminianism is an imported product, but he also offers evidence on the controversies about the doctrines of Barrett, Baro, and the Lambeth Articles, which would seem to contradict his assertion.[1] His argument runs as follows:

> Not one authorized or approved Writer of our Church (for I count not Barret, Thomson, Mountague, or Iackson such, the only opposites to them, that I know off, and those generally opposed, by all our Orthodox Divines) who did ever once oppugne them; yea al such who have formerly but barked against them in their inconsiderate Sermons, have beene forced to sing a publicke Palinodie for their paines: as the Recantations of Barret, Sympson, and others largely testifie:...And shall wee now beginne to question, whether they are the Doctrines of our Church or not because some pur. blinde, squint-eyed ideall Arminian novellists, begin for to dispute it? What is this but to make a scruple, whether the day be light or no; because Buzzards, and blind-men cannot see it? or sottishly to enquire, whether the Sunne stands centred in one constant climate, while the massie Earth wheeles round; because one brainesicke Copernicus out of the sublimitie of his quintessentiall, transcendentall Speculations, hath more senselesly, then

---

that the largest element in English Arminianism is the influence of the Dutch Arminian doctrine, which to my mind is fallacious. There is no indication that the English Arminians, when they came to be so called, had any more sense of unity with the Dutch Remonstrants than Andrewes manifested at the time of Grotius' visit to England.

[1] "When these Arminian Errours were first broached by Barret, and Baro, in Queene Elizabeth's happy Reigne, the zeale of our Reverend Prelates, and University heads was such, that they forthwith proceeded judicially against them, not suffering them to rest or harbour in our Church:" (Par. 2 of his prefatory "Address to the Reverend Archbishops" etc.)

Metaphysically, more ridiculously, then singularly averred it? 1

---

1 1630 edition, A3. He backs the claim that they were not "authorized or approved" by the marginal note: "Three of their bookes were not lycensed".
Barrett, and Thomson I shall discuss in later chapters. Montague I have already mentioned. Thomas Jackson (1579-1640) was Dean of Peterborough, and President of Corpus Christi College Oxford, for the latter years of his life. He was a friend of Laud, and favored by him. He intended, as his biographer tells us in the Life prefixed to his *Works* (1672-1673, three Folio Volumes) a complete body of divinity. He turned his attacks mostly on the Roman Catholic doctrines, but on the dangers of the doctrine of absolute predestination he was outspoken. He published in his lifetime nine books of comments on the Creed, and part of a twelfth, as well as twelve sermons or treatises relating to two of the nine books. The rest of his works embodied in these volumes were preserved by Archbishop Sheldon (who also had a hand in the preservation of some of Hooker's manuscripts.) In 1628 Henry Burton preached a sermon, probably to the Parliament, entitled *Israel's Fast*. In the Epistle he prefixed to its published form Burton cited a statement in a recent book by Jackson as a "most Blasphemous Arminian Heresie." This book was a *Treatise of the Divine Essence and Attributes*. Jackson answered Burton in print soon thereafter. He admitted that he wanted "to make it appear how deeply it concerns every Loyal member of the Church and Commonweal of England (especially such as are engaged with me to maintain the Religion which we all profess, against the Doctrine of the Church of Rome) to prevent the further spreading of that rigid doctrine of absolute Reprobation, as it is held by most, if not by all, which have hitherto excepted against the aforementioned Treatise..." (Vol.III,p.177) But he claims that he has been misquoted by Burton, and that he does not agree with Arminius in all his doctrines. Sympson was one Edward Sympson, fellow of Trinity, who in 1616 preached before James at Royston. There were two points to his sermon: one that the commission of any great sin extinguishes grace and God's Spirit for a time in the man who commits it, and, two: that in Romans VII Paul was speaking of himself not as 'regenerate' but *sub-statu legis*. (Heylyn's *Quinquarticular History*, p. 632) James was furious, for the second point represented a doctrine which had been traced, in Arminius, to Socinus. He sent to Cambridge for an opinion and two of the three professors consulted affirmed that the passage was in reference to a regenerate man. Heylyn's point is that James did not insist on a retractation of the first point, and thus one is to assume that he did not think it hereti-

He quotes Robert Abbot's statement in the Epistle Dedictory to his De Gratis et Perseverantia Sanctorum, "some ten yeares since", that

> ...the stinking vapours of Arminius...had beene blowne over from the Belgique shores upon our English coast, and so infatuated some of our Divines, that leaving the beaten and approved path of faith, they betooke themselves unto the crooked wayes and praecipices of Arminius, destroying the Articles of our Religion with their Tenents, which they had formerly confirmed. 1

The rapid spread of this doctrine in the 1620's is indicated in Prynne's description of the emergency which brings him to compile this book.:

> ...it grieves me to consider...that not onely all kinds of Pseudo-Lutheran and Arminian; but even of Iesuiticall Popish books (which have arrived here of late in great varietie and abundance, without the least restraint) are now more diligently inquired after, more speedily and greedily bought up and vented, though at excessive rates; more studiously, more commonly read, more generally quoted, more plausiblie vouched in Sermons, Schooles and Writings; more highly magnified in the hearts and lips of many, then the best and learnedest of all Forraigne, or our own unmatched protestant Writers, whose Impressions almost canker for want of use, and sometimes perish in the Printers hands, for want of Chapman for to vent them. 2

---

cal. Sympson was enjoined to retract, but on the first occasion he did not do so, and James, even more infuriated, made him preach before him once again; this time he performed as was demanded. (Birch, The Court and Times of James I, II, 65.)

1 Page 2.

2 1629 edition, "To the Christian Reader". Arminianism was, of course, not only doctrinal to Prynne. He goes on: "It is but a bridge, an usher unto Popery, and all Popish Ceremonies, which winde themselves into our Church apace (if Parliament complaints proove true) by their Arminian Agents, as some new erected Altars, Images, Tapers, and late usured Altar-adorations, with the revolt of sundry Arminians unto Popery, doe experimentally testifie."

There is one piece of evidence, which Prynne adduces, which might justify our placing the beginnings of the influence of Arminianism in the English Church about 1615, if precise confirmation could be made. Prynne cites as one of the bases of the Anti-Arminian doctrine of the English Church the "Certaine Questions and Answers touching the Doctrine of Predestination" which, beginning in 1607 he says, were bound in with the English Bibles sold in England. These, he says, "...were alwaies Printed at the end of the old Testament, and bound up and sold Cum Privilegio, with this Authorized Translation of the Bible, till the yeere 1615, since which no Bibles of this sort were Printed. We may therefore use it as a pregnant testimony, a punctuall declaration of the Doctrine of our Church, in the particular points of Controversie hereafter mentioned."[1]

It would take many months to confirm or deny the truth of this assertion, and there is no further evidence that can be found about who was responsible for this disappearance of the Catechism from the Bible. One thing is sure: its first appearance was not in 1607. The Geneva Bible printed in London by Christopher Barker in 1579 seems to be the first English edition to contain this series of questions and answers. This, say Darlow and Moule, in the Historical Catalogue of the British and Foreign Bible Society,[2] was

---

[1] 1630 edition, page 54. This whole point was an afterthought. He does not cite it in the 1629 edition.

[2] Darlow, T. H., and H. F. Moule, Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Volume I, English, London, 1903.

"Apparently the earliest in the long series of quarto Geneva Bibles printed in England." The Catechism does not appear in the 1578 folio, but it continues to appear, as Prynne says, right up to 1615, and then disappears, in all the editions of 1616 that I have been able to examine. Strype, in his Annals of the Reformation, dates its introduction into the Geneva Bible in 1582. He says, under that date:

> This Year was also printed at London, the Old and New Testament in Quarto, Black Letter. Where 'tis remarkable at the End of the New Testament is added a Catechism, that was framed by some person unknown (whether Cartwright, Travers, or some others) intitled, Certain Questions and Answers touching the Doctrine of Predestination, and the Use of God's Word and Sacraments. Wherein the Doctrine of Absolute Election and Reprobation is asserted. And this Catechism joined to the Bible without any publick Licence and Authority (as it seems) remained in After-Editions of the Holy Scripture for divers Years. 1

Strype, like Heylyn before him, asserts that if this were the true doctrine of the Church of England, it would have been approved by Convocation and it would have been in the Folio editions of the Bible. Since neither of these things is so, it is not the doctrine of the Church of England. Heylyn says that they cannot be of much import if they are not of any older standing than 1607. He thinks "...they were foisted

---

1 John Strype, Annals of the Reformation...., four volumes, London, 1728, II, 157.
C. H. Timperley, in the Encyclopedia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote, London, 1842, p. 364, in mentioning that this Catechism was found in this 1578 Bible, cites one "Beloe", as having warned that these 'Certain questions and answers' were "not drawn up by our reformers, as asserted in the Bishops Bible, in the preface to which Archbishop Parker maintains universal redemption". This seems to be the faint echo of some eighteenth-century theological thesis, which has since fallen from sight.

in by the fraud and practice of some of the Emissaries of the Puritan Faction: who hoped in time to have them pass as current amongst the people as any part of Canonical Scripture."[1]

Besides the support it lends to the fact which I am to treat of later on, that the Church of England was Calvinistic under Elizabeth, this argument of Prynne's indicates that the Arminian influence in 1615 was strong enough to have this series of questions and answers quietly dropped from the Bible. Hardin Craig, Jr., in his study of the Geneva Bible, mentions the fact that 1611 was a good time for the translation of the Bible, for "Arminianism had not yet made its influence felt in England". So we may perhaps put the rise of Arminianism somewhere between these two dates. There may also be some significance in the fact which Dr. Craig mentions, that one of the charges brought against Laud was that he had forbidden the importation of Geneva Bibles.[2]

But the principal significance of Fuller's statement is wider. It marks, in fact, the date for the shift that makes the Civil War inevitable. The disagreement now has moved from matters of discipline and church government to matters of doctrine. Wakeman says:

> The twenty years during which Abbot ruled over the Church of England were critical years in her history.

---

[1] Quinquarticular History, p. 631.

[2] Hardin Craig, Jr., The Geneva Bible as a Political Document, thesis Harvard PhD., typescript, 1937, p. 240.

> It was during that time that the Puritan opposition to the Church became identified with the Parliamentary opposition to the Crown, and that the Catholic revival in the Church became identified with prerogative government.[1]

It was not by economic or social evolution alone that the Puritan was finally convinced that the only hope for his ideals was to oppose the monarchy, and it was not only the high-handed oppressions that the monarchy worked upon the liberty of the subject which brought him to lift his hand against his king. His conviction that the Church of England is not only corrupt and misguided in its discipline, but that it has also been corrupted doctrinally is the final straw. Up to this point the Puritans have for the most part constituted a sect in the church; they have attacked their opponents almost entirely on the grounds of discipline. Now they find that their doctrine constitutes heresy for those who rule the Church. From here on, wherever the fault may lie, the Puritan must change the whole doctrine of the Church or leave it. The tragedy of the Civil War is, of course, that there were many doctrinal Puritans who were political Arminians, like Ussher and Hall,[2] and many doctrinal Arminians who were political Puritans, like John Goodwin.[3]

---

[1] The Church and the Puritans, p. 95.

[2] Hall's Via Media, for which he was abused by both sides, is typical of the work he did in trying to hold together what was rapidly slipping apart. It was probably written soon after his return from the Synod of Dort. (Published in The Remaining Works of...Bishop Hall, London, 1660.)

[3] Although Goodwin's conversion to Arminianism did not come until 1650 (Thomas Jackson, The Life of John Goodwin, London, 1872.)

When the word Arminian begins to be used for denominating an English doctrinal-political position, it marks the point at which the struggle within the Church of England, by coming to include doctrine, on which there had before been general agreement, begins to imply a basic difference between two explicit views of life and theories of government. James I is the classic example of the intellectual schizoid that this new era of crisis produces. He thought he could go on being a good Calvinist doctrinally, and still retain the Divine Right of Kings. His confusion is increasingly pitiful (and it is complicated, of course by his inordinate intellectual vanity) between his political disagreement with the men he agreed with doctrinally, as seen at the Hampton Court Conference, and his doctrinal disagreement with the men he agreed with politically, although the full extent of this latter disagreement was carefully kept from him by the men like Bancroft and Andrewes who disagreed with his high predestinarian views. James appoints Abbot Archbishop of Canterbury because he is a stout and orthodox High Calvinist, and is sorely disappointed at his lack of enthusiasm for prosecuting the offensive against the Puritans. He enters vigorously into the quarrel between Remonstrant and Counter-Remonstrant in the Netherlands on the side of doctrinal orthodoxy; when Grotius shows him that the Counter-Remonstrants are the equivalent politically of the Puritans, he draws back and reverses his stand, only to be persuaded again, by the combined efforts of Winwood and Abbot, of the primacy of the doctrinal in the quarrel, and to decide to lend the prestige of the English Church to the decisions of the Synod of Dort. He evidently had not the wit to see that the final victory of the Calvinists at Dort meant that the political implications of international Calvinism, which he feared above all things, had also received a tremendous lift in prestige.

The changes which Burton introduces into successive editions of The Anatomy of Melancholy may serve to indicate this change from discipline to doctrine. In his first edition of 1621 he concentrates his attack on those who

> ...will admit of no ceremonies at all, no fasting dayes, no crosse in Baptisme, kneeling at Communion, no Church musicke, &c. no Bishops Courts, and Church gouernment, rayle at all our Church discipline, and will not hold their tongues, and all for the peace of thee O Syon. 1

His position is that of the orthodox Anglican. Doctrinally, he attacks only the Brownists, Barrowists and other "Schismaticks", in addition to the usual "Epicures", "Atheists", "Hypocrites" etc. In 1624 he adds a whole section (Part 3, sect. 4, Memb. 2, subsec. 3.) to "settle their distressed soules" who indulge in "This furious curiosity, needlesse speculation, fruitlesse meditation about Election, reprobation, free-will, grace..."[2] It is then that he says:

---

[1] Page 755. This passage remains in the later editions, of course.

[2] "This furious curiosity...torment still and crucify the soules of too many" he says, and in 1638 he adds feelingly: "and set all the world together by the ears." Burton remains a good Calvinist all through the Anatomy. In his section 'of the Will' he asserts the familiar Reformation doctrine that the will is free but only to do evil; it is otherwise depraved, ("except we be regenerate, and led by the Spirit").

> ...to mitigate those divine Aphorismes (though in another extreame) our late Arminians have revived that plausible doctrine of universall grace, which many Fathers, our late Lutherans and moderne Papists doe still mainetaine, that we have free-will of our selves, & that Grace is common to all that will beleeve.

There is no doubt about his view of the question. The index lists it as "Arminians censured", but as the editions are progressively revised he changes his specifications of what the Arminian position consists of, and he gets less sure that the whole English Church is united on the doctrine of High Calvinism. In 1624 he summarizes at great length the views of those who hold that the heathen may at last be saved, as the logical extension of the doctrine of general grace, and scorns it as a doctrine under which the "very divells themselves shall be saved at last...." "But these absurd paradoxes are exploded by our Church", he goes on, "we teach otherwise". In 1628 this becomes "as most of our church holde", and in 1638 "as many of our Churche holde". The split is apparent, and it is not certain, either, that Burton himself stayed with the orthodox wing. The confident "we" is gone out of his statement of the doctrine of the church. He is standing aside from both of them in the later editions, it seems. And the arguments against absolute predestination are expanded as the editions go on, until the statement of the opposition almost overwhelms the old faith. In 1638 he must include also the Socinians. In the following transcription I indicate the additions of 1628 by brackets [] and those of 1638, thus: /.

...upright livers, no matter of what Religion, as Cornelius, out of any Nation, so that he live honestly, call on God, trust in him, feare him he shall be saved. This opinion was formerly maintained by the Valentinian and Basilidean hereticks, revived of late in Turkie of which sect Rustan Bassa was patron, defended by Galeatius Martius, / and some ancient fathers, and of later times favoured by Erasmus, Zuinglius in *exposit: fide ad Regem Galliae*, whose Tenet Bullinger vindicates, and Gualter approves in a just Apology with many arguments....But to returne to my author/His conclusion is, that not only wicked livers, Blaspheamers, Reprobates & such as reiect Gods grace, but that the very divells themselves shall be saved at last as Origen long since delivered in his works/and our late Socinians defend, Ostorodius cap.41. institut. Smaltius, &c. Those termes of all and for ever in scripture, are not eternall, but onely denotate a longer time, which by many examples they prove. The world shall end like a comedy, and wee shall meet at last in Heaven, and live in blisse altogether; or else in conclusion, *in nihil evanescere*. [For how can hee bee mercifull that shall condemne any creature to eternall unspeakable punishment for one small temporary fault, all posterity, so many myriades, for one and an other mans offence, *quid meruistis oves?*] /But these absurd paradoxes are exploded by our Church, we teach otherwise. That this vocation, predestination, election [reprobation, *non ex corruptâ massâ, praevisa fide*, as our Arminians, or *ex praevisis operibus*, as our Papists, *non ex praeteritione* but Gods absolute decree, *ante mundum creatum*, (as most of our church holde / as many of our Church holde/)] was from the beginning, before the foundation of the world was laid,/or *homo conditus* [(or from Adams fall, as others will, *homo lapsus objectum est reprobationis*) [we hold/with *perseverantia sanctorum* /, /we must be certaine of our salvation, we may fall but not finally, which our Arminians will not admit. According to his immutable, eternall, just decree and counsel of saving men and Angells, God calls all, and would have all to bee saved according to the efficacy of his vocation all are invited, but only the elect apprehended, the rest that are unbeleeving, impenitent, whom God in his iust iudgement leaves to be punished for their sinnes, are in a reprobate sense; yet wee must not determine who are such, condemne our selves or others, because wee have an universall invitation, all are commanded to beleeve, and we knowe not how soon or late before our end we may be receaved. 1

---

1 The addition of *praevisa fide*, foreknowledge, to the

In 1638 he adds:

> I might have said more of this subject, but forasmuch as it is a forbidden question, and in the Preface or Declaration to the Articles of the Church, printed 1633, to avoid factions & altercations we that are Universitie Divines especially are prohibited all curious search, to print or preach, or draw the Articles aside by our own sence and Comments, upon paine of Ecclesiasticall censure, I will surcease, and conclude with Erasmus of such controversies; Pugnet qui volet, ego censeo leges majorum reverentur suscipiendas & religiose observandas, velut a Deo profectas, necesse tutum, necesse pium, de potestate publica sinistram concipere aut serere suspitionem. Et si quid est tyrannidis, quod tamen non cogat ad impietatem, satius est ferre, quam seditiose reluctari.

The history of the growth of Arminianism in England, then, must begin, not with the time at which the term itself begins to be used, but with the events that lead up to this doctrinal split which makes the rift in the English church and society complete.

The question of whether the Elizabethan settlement was Calvinistic or Lutheran in doctrine is the very center of the Arminian-Puritan argument from the 1620's to well into the nineteenth century. I shall summarize some of the documents and points of view in this controversy at more length

---

enumeration of the characteristics of Arminianism in the later edition, bears out my observation that the first issue on which Arminianism arises is the perseverance of the Saints; then follows freedom of the will, and the full revaluation of the doctrine by the addition of God's foreknowledge is a later modification. Sometime between 1624 and 1628 Burton becomes aware that this is a characteristic doctrine of Arminianism. His acceptance of the doctrine that "all are commanded to beleeve" is also significant. This is the stand for which Baro had been attacked by Chaderton in 1581.

later on. I must conclude from my researches in the subject that there can be little doubt about the fact that the Church of England was Calvinistic at the time of the Elizabethan Settlement[1] and for some time thereafter. My prime object is, of course, to decide when the change to another doctrine began. The specific evidence on either side is sparse. The fact is, that almost no one makes doctrine the subject of discussion within the early Elizabethan Church.[2] The obvious assumption from this fact is that everyone was agreed on doctrine and thus there was no point in discussing it. The growth of the disagreement on doctrine is double. On the one hand, certain elements in the church seek to liberalize the doctrinal Calvinism that obtains, but also, the Calvinists are continually attempting to make their doctrines more rigid. It is difficult to say which side begins its process first.

---

[1] One of the best statements of the whole truth is this one by F. M. Powicke: (The Reformation in England, Oxford, 1941, p. 111.) "In Elizabeth's reign the Church had a medieval constitution, and a comprehensive liturgy, in which ancient, medieval Lutheran and Zuinglian elements were welded together in beautiful English. The theology most prevalent among its ministers was Calvinist. Any independence which it might gradually acquire in men's minds had to find expression in the course of controversy ...."
And G. G. Perry says: (History of the Church of England, New York, 1876, p. 351.) "Up to nearly the close of the reign of Elizabeth the English divines were almost universally Calvinist. We get glimpses occasionally of a bold man enunciating something as to free will (such as Bishop Cheyney of Gloucester) but it was regarded as rank heresy."

[2] For an outstanding example see the Letter by George Cranmer to Hooker (included in the World's Classics edition of Walton's Lives), in which he summarizes the whole Puritan controversy at the time. There is no hint there that the battle included any disagreement on doctrine, although the controversy as Cartwright waged it was intense enough in

My conclusion, from a study of Baro and Hooker, is that the Arminians begin it, but that the progressive stringency of High Calvinism cannot be completely accounted for in describing it as a reaction to the earliest form of Arminianism. As has been said "...from the friends of Calvinism within the bosom of the Church of England, there is always escaping something by which they show, that they do not consider the articles as reaching to the extent of their system."[1] The High Calvinists early begin, as a part of their campaign to revise the polity and ceremonies of the Church, a campaign to tighten the dogmatic rigidity of the 39 Articles. Their attitude in so doing, however, I must admit, does not seem to be that of men who are sure of their ground. The atmosphere of the first clash between the two parties, which I am going to discuss below, has all the characteristics of a meeting engagement in war. Both sides act as if the territory were occupied by the enemy.

Another reason why doctrine is not at first a subject of discussion can be seen in the fact that it is the rapid advance of rationalism and of an ideal of intellectual consistency which brings the battle to a head. When it becomes impossible for a man to be an Anglican Calvinist, the split is complete. This study is essentially of the developments

---

all faith to have produced such an issue if it had been considered even barely pertinent. There are only a very few hints of it in the Marprelate controversy. (see below Chapter V).

[1] William White, Comparative Views of the Controversy Between the Calvinists and the Arminians, two volumes, Philadelphia, 1817, p. 184.

which made that split.

If we consider, however, the danger in which England stood all through the reign of Elizabeth, from Spain and France, and from all the political maneuverings of the Church of Rome, another consideration must be included. Keble notes, in his preface to his edition of Hooker,[1] that Bancroft's first enunciation of the doctrine of the Divine institution of Bishops was in 1588, just after the danger from the Armada was passed, and that Bancroft's sermon was closely followed by Saravia's books on the same subject. As long as the foreign political threat is acute the pressure is overwhelming to stay by the doctrines of High Calvinism as the best defence against Rome. As Overton puts it:

> in the reaction against Rome that marked the sixteenth century, English Church men threw themselves into that system which was most opposed to Rome, and became Calvinists, or, rather, Augustinians. 2

And Hunt says:

> Calvinism was the embodiment of Christian doctrine that grew out of the necessities of the Reformation. A milder form of the doctrine of grace might have been ineffectual to check the errors of the Church of Rome.... 3

More important, perhaps, was the fact that the Puritans knew that they had many of the lower classes to convince.

---

1 John Keble, ed., The Works of...Mr. Richard Hooker, three volumes, Oxford, 1836, I, lxiv.
2 The Church in England, II, 30.
3 Religious Thought in England, I, 369.

The Puritans not only knew that, in their disciplinarian views, they were as yet a minority of the clergy in those early days, that in both discipline and doctrine they had a large and influential group at Court, and all the queen's religious instincts (few as they were) against them, but they also knew that the greater part of the people had not yet become aware that there had been any doctrinal change involved in the Reformation. Wakeman says:

> The Calvinistic movement of Elizabeth's reign had mainly affected the Clergy, and the laity in the larger towns. The country people still remained Catholic in sympathies. 1

And Professor Allen says:

> At the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth, when the religion of the masses seems still to have been a confused and formless Catholicism, the exigencies of the situation had compelled her to work through Calvinistic bishops. The higher clergy had gradually succeeded in giving to the Church a semi-Calvinistic tone. But the number of convinced Calvinists in England can never have been anything but small proportionately. 2

He cites Josias Nichols' Plea of the Innocent of 1602, who reported that in questioning his 400 communicants he found that almost all of them affirmed that man could be saved by good works and prayers. Professor Miller cites William Perkins' enumeration of some of the notions he found current among the laity in the 1590's:

> That God is served by the rehearsing of the ten commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creede.
> That none can tell whether he shall be saved or no certenly.
> That it is the safest to doe in Religion as most doe. 3

---

1 The Church and the Puritans, p. 80.
2 English Political Thought, 1603-1660, pp. 124-125.
3 The New England Mind, New York, 1939, p. 86.

This uncertainty in both camps accounts for the tentative way in which the High Calvinists go about enforcing their narrowing of dogma, which begins with the Lambeth Articles. They are patently not sure of their ground. Their successors in the 1620's are surer of theirs.

Whatever the reasons, the phenomenon upon which I am to focus is clear. There is a tremendous change in accepted doctrines within a short space of time. It has been probably most clearly put by John Dowden:

> And it is one of the curious phenomena in the history of doctrine that without any authoritative pronouncement on the subject, or the production of any really great controversial treatise, there was in course of time a general shifting of opinion, till Calvinism ceased to be a considerable power within the bounds of the Church of England....In the later years of Elizabeth the battlemented stronghold of Calvinism towered aloft and dominated the Church. It was supported by those in highest station. It seemed to stand secure. The fire of no heavy theological artillery was directed against it. It was assaulted by no great leader of thought, and its position seemed to call for no active defence. Yet gradually, one knows not how, its strength was sapped; and in time it came to be like a great frowning fortress silently abandoned. Its compacted stones were loosened, as it were, by wind and weather, and before fifty years it had become, as a power in the theological thought of the Church of England, no better than a crumbling ruin. 1

In 1573 Whitgift, in answering Cartwright's attacks on the Establishment, wrote:

> The doctrine 'of free will', because it is an enemy to the grace of God, must needs be of itself a damnable doctrine;....2

---

1 Outlines of the History of the Theological Literature of the Church of England, London, 1897, S.P.C.K., p. 67.

2 Defence of the Aunswere to the Admonition...., John Ayre ed., The Works of John Whitgift, three volumes, Cambridge, The Parker Society, 1851-1853, II, 189.

And in listing Cartwright's errors in *A Note of such dangerous points of doctrine as are avouched by T. C. in his Reply*, Whitgift claims that:

> 4. He holdeth that 'the doctrine of free-will is not repugnant to salvation;' and yet is it a doctrine clean contrary to free justification by Christ.[1]

He is here attempting to make it appear that it is the Puritan who defends the doctrine of free-will.

In contrast we may take the day, just fifty years later, when another archbishop of the same church, William Laud, on April 9, 1625, put into the hands of Buckingham a list of all those eligible for preferment in the Church, with the mark "P" or "O" set beside each name, denoting that they were "Puritan" or "Orthodox". Now the orthodox are those who believe that same doctrine of free-will which both Whitgift and Cartwright had denied.

Later disputants and church historians have differed about what took place between these two dates. They are usually directing their arguments toward influencing the Church of England toward a further doctrinal development in their own particular direction in their own day. Part of my purpose is to attempt a judicial decision between the merits of the arguments on both sides. This is not the place to render a decision, but I must reiterate that the important consideration is not so much what the doctrinal principles of the Elizabethan Church were, as that doctrine was not, at the beginning, the question. Whitgift's volumes of argument with Cartwright and Cartwright's replies do not again mention the point. However, the widening of the dispute at a certain point begins to bring the element of doctrine in, and it develops into the ideological separation which underlies the Civil War. W. H. Frere says of the first dispute between Puritan and Establishment:

---

[1] III, p. 552.

> ...it was all a matter of Church polity; doctrinal difference, as at present, there was none to be seen within the horizon....Later on, however, the intimate connection of doctrine with the disputes on Church polity was bound to make itself clear, and personal characteristics as well as doctrine and polity could not fail to show itself a determining factor in ranging a man as a catholic or a puritan churchman. 1

We may perhaps attribute the entrance of doctrine to the growing intellectualization of the Church, which is, of course the result of the increased learning of the clergy, itself resulting from the Anglican appeal to history as the support of doctrine. But that appeal to history itself is the result of the necessities brought on by the great two-sided campaign of polemics which the Church had to wage: against the Puritan within and the Roman Catholic without. We may also add the more extreme sects like the Anabaptists and the Brownists upon whom both Anglican and Puritan turn

---

1 The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, London, 1904, p. 114.
The fact that the quarrel is about discipline, about ceremonies and symbolic vestments, about the symbolic content of material acts and things in one era, and about the idea-content of formularies and intellectual concepts in the later era, says volumes about the difference between the aesthetics of the two times, and the principles out of which they write.

their wrath. As the process of argument grows, doctrine becomes a more conscious part of the polemic, and consistency between discipline and doctrine seems to be more of a necessity. Thus the Anglican gradually comes to realize that absolute predestination is inconsistent with the kind of Church polity that he is entrusted with defending. The concept of the Church in the state as a part of the body politic is to my mind controlling; as these men come to defend the status quo they find that they can only do it consistently on terms which involve the modification of the doctrine which was the absolute backbone of the Elizabethan Church. In a recent consideration of the problem, J. W. Allen says:

> Neither in its liturgy nor in its formal organization was the Elizabethan Church Calvinistic. If the Articles leaned that way, they were yet carefully ambiguous. The bishop might, in official theory, be essentially a royal commissioner; but in the long run official theory mattered little. To the religious the bishop was either much more or was altogether objectionable. Thoroughgoing Calvinists tended to go into opposition. On the other hand, the inchoate Catholicism of the masses gradually disintegrated altogether and for the most part disappeared. But the old forms survived to such an extent that, within them, a new religion of the old type could develop. It had begun to appear before the death of Elizabeth. 1

The process is not quite as simple as this would make it appear. There was a thoroughgoing drive by the High Calvinists to capture the Church (which, indeed, they thought was theirs from the beginning) and to narrow the unfortunate

---

1 English Political Thought, p. 124.

latitude of the 39 Articles so that there could be no doubt about the Calvinist orthodoxy of the Church as far as doctrine was concerned. The evidence indicates that the High Calvinists take the offensive in this as in their drive on the Church's polity, and that they consider themselves completely successful after the Synod of Dort. That event, however, actually marks the beginning of the end, and the advent of Laud drives them out of the Church. Their only recourse then is war.

The process is fairly accurately put by Wakeman:

> Insensibly men became aware of the incompatibility of the system of the Church with the doctrine of Calvin....we find, as characteristic of the Laudian or Arminian movement, that the doctrine of sacramental grace was insisted upon, and the idea of worship revived. In fact, the more the Church came to realize her own position, the more she was forced to part company with Calvinism;...[1]

In 1853 Edward Beecher, in describing the downfall of Calvinism in the United States in the eighteenth century, defined quite closely the way in which the change took place in the seventeenth century in England. The doctrine of depravity, he says, can be destroyed in two ways:

> ...first by a direct theoretical assault on the doctrine; secondly, by the adoption of practical measures which involve false principles, and can be defended only by them, while the true doctrine is nominally retained. In the latter case, the danger is peculiarly insidious in its approaches. There is no open assault on orthodoxy, and yet a feeling of self-consistency gradually impels all men to bring their theoretical principles into harmony with their practise. [2]

---

[1] The Church and the Puritans, pp. 80-81.

[2] "The Works of Samuel Hopkins", Biblioteca Sacra, X (1853), p. 70.

Both of these elements combined to bring down predestination in England. There was a direct theoretical assault on the extremes of the doctrine by Baro and Overall at Cambridge, and later at Oxford by Laud, Buckeridge, and Howson; Bancroft's reconstruction of the English Church carried out practical measures which implied basic principles with which the High Calvinist doctrine could not live, and the intellectual justification of those principles by Hooker and his followers joined the two processes.[1]

In so far as the Arminian movement in the Church of England is an advance toward a full consistency between discipline and doctrine, and the Puritan movement from the beginning is an attempt to introduce a consistency between doctrine and discipline, they are both symptoms of advancing rationalism which fed science. The truth of science is consistency. Calvinism and Episcopalianism could get along in England as long as it was not considered impossible to live on inconsistent planes. From both the Puritan and the Anglican side men were increasingly intent on squaring their actions with their theories, and with working out their theories systematically. Thus the Puritan appeal in the vestments controversy is that England carry out the theoretic implications of the Reformation, and Hooker's answer is to justify the sort of Church England has as consistent with a universal concept of law.

---

1 Keble concluded that Hooker's defence of the polity of the Church and especially of the validity of the sacraments led him to a more liberal doctrinal stand. My conclusion from an examination of the doctrines Hooker held even before he began the Polity and the closeness of their agreement with those of Baro is that the process may have been the other way around.

There is a sense in which the spirit of English Arminianism is part of the tendency which would impede the advance of rationalism and the science which the latter nourished and fed. In the sense that the school of Jewel, Hooker, and Andrewes rested their efforts theologically on the restoration of what had been, they of course favor the tendencies which oppose science. As Addleshaw puts it, they do not "...emasculate Christian truth by trying to reconcile it with the spirit of the age."[1] And the Thomism and Aristotelianism in which they found the basis of their rhetoric and their concept of the physical universe was certainly the enemy of the new spirit to which Bacon was appealing. The universe of Hooker's Of the Laws of Ecclesiasticall Polity is one of supreme medieval rationalism. The attack on Baro in 1580 is summarized thus by Anthony a Wood in his Fasti Oxonienses:

> Besides also, as they observed, that after many years, wherein he had sundry ways hurt the sincerity of the doctrine, he brought the popish schoolmen into credit and diminished the honour of the learned writers of that age. Since which time the course of studies in divinity, and the manner of preaching hath been much changed in that university by some who have followed that vain; and left the study of sound writers (as they stile them) and apply themselves to the reading (as they further add) of popish, barbarous and fantasticall schoolmen, delighted with their curious questions and quiddities, whereby they draw all points of Christian faith into doubts, being the high-way not only to popery, but to atheism, &c. 2

---

[1] G. W. O. Addleshaw, The High Church Tradition: A Study in the Liturgical Thought of the Seventeenth Century, London, 1941.

[2] Philip Bliss, ed., four volumes, London, 1815, II, 274 ff.

The language here sounds like Bacon's attack on the Schoolmen. The state of mind that made the age welcome science was partly made by the Protestant disavowal of medieval theological doctrine.

And yet, what the Puritans are defending with these brave new words is merely a new scholasticism, without the medieval grounding of humanism, and Baro's was a critique of this scholasticism in many ways parallel to the work of the Erasmian Reformers one hundred years earlier. There is a sense in which the intellectual stage is being set for the advance of science as much in the beginnings of Arminianism as in Puritanism. It has been claimed that there were clear affinities between science and rational Puritanism[1] but that was a late development. Faced with the growth of Calvinist dogma in the 1590's, English Arminianism develops a doctrine of historical relativity, which will provide a historical basis for justification of the whole questioning of authority on which science feeds. I shall show in my discussion of Baro how his arguments against High Calvinist predestination foreshadow the philosophy on which Bacon established the validity and respectability of science. It is the cornerstone of Bacon's philosophy that God as First Cause operates in the world only by secondary causes. The same impulse is deeper than verbal coincidence in the Arminian insistence that God does not condemn man without cause.

---

[1] Dorothy Stimson, "Puritanism and the New Philosophy in Seventeenth Century England", Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine, III, (1935).

The cause of election and reprobation must be in the world and in the actions of men, not outside the natural operation of cause and effect.

Where Jewel rests his arguments in support of the English Church on the Fathers and the Old Testament - that is, on authority alone - Hooker rests his not only on authority but on the power of reason in the interpretation of the Bible. His is, as Professor Jordan says, the defence of a Rationalist against the Scripturalists. Science will find its support in the Rationalists, not the Scripturalists.

Helen White says:

> The same passion for precise and manageable notions that plays so large a part in the acceptance of the new science was earlier manifest in the field of theology. Grace and Free Will had collided before the Reformation period, and the difficulties inherent in the recognition of the two at once had been canvassed pretty thoroughly, but yet Christianity had managed to hold onto both sides. But to the seventeenth-century mind, it was one or the other....Much of the fanaticism of the seventeenth century is due to that very passion for precision and consistency that in the field of science was to achieve such notable results. 1

---

1 The Metaphysical Poets, A Study in Religious Experience, New York, 1936, p. 45.
Another, and perhaps deeper, reason why Puritanism and science worked well together lies in the fact that Calvinism refuses to except man from the order of nature as Renaissance humanism did, in order to enhance the power of God. Chaderton will not accept Baro's explanation that man has free-will in secondary causes. All causation is from God for the Puritan. When science then excepts the order of nature from God, the process is complete; man is in it, and not above it.

Something omitted here? this does not seem to follow p. 63

the philosophical apologia for the separation of faith and reason that science needs to get under way. The assumptions behind Anglican church discipline that the universe is of a piece, and that physical and spiritual truth are somehow allied, is nevertheless important also for the growth of science. This is the faith of Newton.

The doctrinal evolution that Arminianism brought may also be seen as a nourishing source for rational skepticism. The seeds of skepticism are in the relativistic view fostered by a reliance on historical perspective and acceptance of the development of truth in history. This historical relativism is the stock in trade of all the Anglican writers after Hooker. T. S. Eliot distinguishes between two kinds of scepticism:

> But one of the features of development, whether we are taking the religious or the cultural point of view, is the appearance of scepticism - by which, of course I do not mean infidelity or destructiveness (still less the unbelief that is due to mental sloth) but the habit of examining evidence and the capacity for delayed decision. Scepticism is a highly civilized trait, though, when it declines into pyrrhonism, it is one of which civilizations can die. Where scepticism is strength, pyrrhonism is weakness: for we need not only the strength to defer a decision, but the strength to make one. [1]

The seventeenth-century scepticism which provides one of the elements for the growth of science is, as has been pointed out, partly the product of classical scepticism, which in the early Donne is pyrrhonism or near it, but in the sense that science becomes respectable and religious men like

---

[1] Notes Toward the Definition of Culture, New York, 1949, p. 28.

Newton and the Restoration bishops can engage in it fully, this other type of scepticism forms an even greater part of the nourishing atmosphere.

In the sense that Arminianism was upper-class, authoritarian, and traditional, the affinity with scepticism comes out in another dimension, as Dr. Krapp has ably connected them in the following passage:

> Generally speaking...we must remember that in Western Europe scepticism was originally and for long a cast of thought which was distinctively of and for the conservative of the upper classes. From Pyrrho of Elis through Montaigne and Dryden down to the present day, the sceptical point of view, which finds no one social order better in itself than another, has always concluded that the existing order is the best simply because it exists.
>
> The point of view which minimizes intellectual values and emphasizes pure royalism, traditionalism, and authoritarianism, has clear historical and rational affinities with mechanistic materialism. Both philosophies conspire from slightly different directions to prove the existing social order inevitable and therefore good. No real inconsistency is involved in making one's private intellectual beliefs uncertain or arbitrary, and the pattern of matter orderly and immutable. [1]

The conventional explanation of the rise of rationalism comes to the conclusion of Mr. Basil Willey, that:

> The contests of Puritan and Prelatist wore down the prestige of the authoritarian beliefs, and opened the way for the explanatory spirit of the age to begin its attack on the traditional material. [2]

Such a view ignores the fact that the beginnings of the retreat from authoritarianism had received official sanction very early. The religious rationalists were not, in the end, a party opposed to the party of 'authority', but a part of it. The fact that this was possible comes from the elements which I have isolated in the beginnings of Arminianism: the historical concept of dogma, the evolution of doctrine. There is also the concept of Law, the mainstay of Hooker's argument, which he extends from the whole universe to the social order, in a way that becomes the mainstay of the philosophy of the rise of science. It is not then coincidental that it is the great Arminian Grotius who applies the concept and categories of law to theological doctrine most fully, in his legalistic doctrine of the Atonement.

---

[1] Liberal Anglicanism, p. 124.
[2] The Seventeenth Century Background, New York, 1934, pp. 120-121.

This definition has led me perhaps too far afield. It remains to summarize in rapid fashion but as fully as I can the ingredients of English Arminianism, before I turn to the central element of this study: the details of the historical situation in which it began and developed.

CHAPTER THREE

THE INGREDIENTS OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

Roughly in the order of their importance, as well as of their historical manifestation, the ingredients of English Arminianism may be summarized as follows:

(1) A concept of the Church which came to fulfill doctrinally the implications of the administrative structure left by the English Reformation.

(2) A free-will theology which attacks the High Calvinist doctrine of Absolute Predestination, first in the universities, and then is adopted by the defenders of the Establishment as the necessary accompaniment of their polity.

(3) This theology may be viewed as the re-assertion of the tradition of Christian Humanism.

(4) Accompanying it is an historical, as distinguished from a rationalistic, revaluation of dogma, which is stimulated by the Puritan attempt to narrow and intensify the dogmatic basis of the English Church.

(5) Having established itself as a consistent whole on a doctrinal and institutional level, the Church proceeds to strengthen itself administratively by the reinvigoration of the High Commission and Convocation, and doctrinally by the assertion of Apostolic Succession and Divine Right of Bishops.

(6) As the 'Arminian' party gains control of the Church offices, they and the monarchy proceed to a revolutionary revision of the traditional Elizabethan 'Erastianism', and to

enforcement of conformity on a new basis.

(7) This process is accompanied by a renewed emphasis on the sacramental nature of the Church, and - paradoxically - by a further revaluation (now with the recognized adherence of the Latitudinarians and other rationalistic moderates) of the whole validity and effect of dogma.

The full course of this process of development and the accretions along the way is beyond the scope of this thesis. I wish here only to emphasize that the end-product is a result of progressive modification of the original ingredients. The implications of the institution left by the Reformation in England required, if it was to be doctrinally consistent, a free-will theology. The defenders of the Establishment apparently became aware of the need for such a doctrinal revision early in their process of defending the Church against the first wave of Puritan attack, in becoming aware of the weakness of the grounds they were making use of in that defence. This theology proves to be the rallying point for a new generation in the Church, which proceeds to strengthen the administrative and political position of the Church, and, making an alliance with the monarchy in the face of renewed Puritan onslaughts, manages to alienate more and more influential and powerful sections of the population, until both the monarchy and the Church are involved in the general ruin. It was not, I think, inevitable that the doctrine which I am here to trace, and the sacramental church it helped develop, should attach itself to the social and political theories of the monarchy, but, for Laud, the Church could find only in the monarchy the power it needed to fulfill its God-given function in the State, and the monarchy could only find its place in the scheme of the universe with the aid of that particular kind of church.

When the term 'Arminian' comes to be used in England as a reproach, Arminianism in the rationalistic sense of the Continent is having its effect in England, but certainly not in those men at whom the term is aimed. It is no wonder that the accusation confuses them. Montague claims stoutly that he has never even read the works of Arminius. Dutch Arminianism is working strongly in the realm of lay thought, in that rational attitude toward religion where it would have its first entrance. But the English Church had developed long since, and was continuing to develop, a parallel doctrine in opposition to High Calvinism. It had its independent beginnings as an answer to the necessities of the Anglican theory of the Church, and had its independent development in Baro, Hooker, Overall, and Andrewes on the doctrinal side, and in Whitgift, Bancroft, and Laud on the administrative and political side. These two streams, rationalistic Dutch Arminianism, and sacramental English Arminianism, come together in the alliance of Laud with the Latitudinarians, notably Hales and Chillingworth. After the Restoration they go their own ways again, the Church toward Deism, the lay thinkers toward a junction with the humanitarianism and the Unitarianism that emerged from the radical fringe of the Puritans.

Certain of the sectaries, of course, developed free-will doctrines of their own quite early also. Robert Barclay points out that the church of Separatists at Amsterdam under Ainsworth "contended with Arminius at an early period,"[1] and the same split that took place in the English Church in England, led to the formation of a new sect within this sect by John Smyth. The doctrinal principles of these General Baptists were contained in a tract, dating probably from 1613 or 1614, called The last book of John Smith called the Retractation of his Errors, and the Confirmation of the Truth. They are headed: "Propositions and Conclusions concerning True Christian Religion, containing a Confession of Faith of Certain English People, Living at Amsterdam".[2] The ninth, tenth, and fourteenth points of this statement assert that God "did foresee and determine the issue and event of all His works", "That God is not the Author or worker of sin", and "That God created man with freedom of will...and that this freedom of will was a natural faculty or power, created by God in the soul of man". However, the seventeenth claims that Adam "...being fallen he still retained freedom of will", which would be anathema to the Calvinists, and not completely acceptable at that point to the Arminians in England. And with the eighteenth, English Arminianism would be entirely out of sympathy, as would the Dutch at that time. It avers

---

[1] Robert Barclay, The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth..., London, 1877, p. 55. Williston Walker, in his History of the Christian Church, (New York, 1924, pp. 465-466.) says that "In the contemporary Dutch controversies they had adopted the Arminian position, and were therefore known as 'General Baptists'."

[2] Printed as Appendix to Chapter VI of Barclay's book. See also M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 330.

"That original sin is an idle term, and that there is no such thing as men intend by that word...." We may, however, say that the first evidences of Dutch Arminianism on English thought are in these sectaries, and not in English Arminianism. I shall discuss this relationship between the two in a later chapter.

Seen in a larger perspective, this movement appears as a second growth of humanism. The basis for the truth of this statement must await documentation in my discussion of Baro in the next chapter. The Renaissance is from one point of view a protest against a restricted view of the possibilities of human nature. At the point where I mark the beginnings of English Arminianism, humanism is making its second protest: against the restricted view of human nature into which Calvinistic doctrine had degenerated. Professor Battenhouse has spelled out in general terms, in Marlowe's Tamburlaine,[1] the way the humanistic influence of French Huguenots worked on Elizabethan Protestantism, and he rightly includes the name of Peter Baro among them. Professor Battenhouse claims that "The predominant party in Elizabethan Protestantism shied away from the systematic theocracy and the dogmatic Biblicism of Geneva", but I can only say, after examining the quarrels over the Lambeth Articles, that if that was the predominant party, it had hard work in establishing its predominance. Professor Battenhouse has there, however, very ably established the ramifications of this development and its alliances with the intellectual life of the time. The issues of the basic split between humanism and Calvinism had been stated in the early days of the Reformation, in the famous exchange between Luther and Erasmus on the Freedom of the Will. "You alone", says Luther to Erasmus, in his De servo arbitrio of 1525, "have entered upon the thing itself that is the grand turning point of the cause...." The dignity of man that Humanism requires is impossible without freedom of the will. Although Luther took his stand against it, his followers under Melanchthon defended the doctrine against the followers of Calvin like Beza who took the original doctrine of Calvin on predestination and intellectualized it into something that Calvin himself had never considered a part of it.

---

[1] Roy W. Battenhouse, Nashville, Tennessee, 1941, pp. 23 ff.

In England it is the necessity of the defence of the Church as it is which brings on the attack on predestination, but the impulses behind it are humanistic. The key to its attack on dogma, as the Calvinists want it to develop, is the view of the uses of history to which they are driven. The Reformation Protestant view of history is that of a mine for arguments to justify doctrines, its documents are viewed as miraculous données from God to reveal truth. The humanist view of history is to see those documents as the production of human beings, and to insist that the doctrines of the present are subject to progressive revelation by further knowledge. It was this humanism that made Casaubon unable to remain a High Calvinist and made his alliance with the English Church inevitable. Matthew Arnold makes the connection in the case of Hooker:

> Hooker's greatness is that he gives the real method of criticism for Church dogma, the historic method. Church dogma is not written in black and white in the Bible, he says, it has to be collected from it; it is, as we now say, a development from it. This and that dogma, says Hooker, 'are in Scripture nowhere to be found by express literal mention, only deduced they are out of Scripture by collection'. And he assigns one right criterion for determining whether a dogma is justly deduced, and what Scripture means, and what is its true character: the criterion of reason. He assigns this with splendid boldness: 'It is not the word of God itself', says he, 'which doth, or possibly can, assure us that we do well to think it his word; No, it is reason....'[1]

The Reformers of the Reformation see their problem only as the substitution of another 'truer' dogma of the same type for the old one. But the humanists go to investigating the real terms of the Primitive Church for indications of the real extent to which dogma should govern. Their attack on the Roman Church is on the basis that Rome has made dogmas out of things indifferent, out of the haphazard accretions of later centuries. Hence their demand for a return to the doctrines of the Primitive Church. And the same resistance to the encroachments of dogma on the realm of reason is the center of the fight they wage against High Calvinism.[2]

---

[1] *Literature and Dogma*, New York, n.d., p. 18.

[2] For the Rationalist historians of Rationalism, it seems impossible that there can be those who oppose dogma and yet accept it too, and that they can be those most responsible for the breakdown of the dogmatic habit of mind. Thus Professor Jordan claims (II, 116) that "The liberalizing of Protestant dogma in England was a contribution, not of the Anglo-Catholics, but of the dissenters, and Professor R. F. Jones points out (*Ancients and Moderns*, St. Louis, 1936, p. 148) that "The insistence upon a critical as opposed to a dogmatic attitude of mind" is the main impulse of revolt in the

The doctrinal revolt at Cambridge at which the Lambeth Articles are aimed might have flared up and subsided were it not for the fact that the defenders of the Establishment were being so hard pressed by the Puritan attack. To defend itself and its political position, the Church had to formulate and defend a doctrine of the Church as a conveyor of sacramental grace. A doctrine of free will is an important accompaniment to such a Church. If man's will is free, if he has a part to play in his own salvation, there must be available means by which he can lay hold on the grace that is offered him, in service and ceremonies which have a real validity. The basic disagreement of these two theories of the Church is seen, of course, in the first full impact of Calvinism on English religious life during the Marian exile. The troubles in Frankfort represent the clash of two theories of the Church, although the participants do not seem to recognize it fully at the time. The Calvinists of Puritan bent believe that vestments and ceremonies are not 'things indifferent', but dangerous in their implication that there are other channels of grace besides Christ and the direct communion of the individual through Christ with God. The Anglicans, in that extra-territorial quarrel, cling to their forms of worship while trying to retain their reformed doctrine. But it must be said that the issues upon which

---

seventeenth century. The fact is that the greatest part of the breakdown of the 'dogmatic attitude of mind' comes from those who are defending the status quo in Church polity in the early days of the century. The similar easy and sweeping generalizations of Tulloch are also no longer admissible.

that doctrine is built are still the issues of the Reformation: the rejection of transubstantiation and of justification by works, the espousal of justification by grace alone. It is only when the dogmatic elaboration of Calvinism begins to freeze into the mold of Absolute Predestination that they feel impelled to question also the doctrinal elements of their opponents. When the quarrel is transferred to England, and the new doctrinal wine is put into the old institutional bottles, the bottles mellow the wine and alter its doctrinal substance for the Anglican, and it eventually becomes apparent for the Puritan that the doctrinal wine must burst the bottles or cease to be the wine he needs. The impossible position of Tudor Puritanism comes from the fact that as loyal Englishmen they must accept a form of the Church which rests on assumptions contrary to their most fundamental doctrine. "In all the schools of Calvinism", says J. T. McNeill, "the doctrine of the church builds upon the assumed fact of predestination".[1] The catholic church must be invisible for the Puritan because the true faith of its members, as Bucer says, is in the heart, and because no man's election is manifest. Thus a church that comes to claim that Bishops are anything but state officials is impossible for them to accept. The church visible and invisible, as Ames says later, are of course two aspects of the same church, and the later

---

[1] John T. McNeil, "The Church in Post-Reformation Reformed Theology", The Journal of Religion, XXIV (1944), 96-107; 98.

Calvinists come to insist that the church visible must be taken as speaking for the church invisible, but in the early days the visible church does not necessarily correspond to the true outlines of the invisible, and no confidence can be placed in its spiritual power as an institution on earth.

The church which the Puritans come into and seek to change is, of course, a defender of the old forms of society, and it is the policy of Elizabeth, James, and Charles to keep it that way. The monarchy needs the church as it is, to keep the political theory on which it rests in working order. The explosive implications for society in Puritanism lie in its atomistic effect. The church invisible does not necessarily contain the whole body of society as members. The doctrine of predestination, then, sets up a spiritual aristocracy which calls into basic question the social foundation of the Anglican communion. For Anglican theory, the church and state are co-extensive. The Anglican church is the religious expression of the social theory on which the English monarchy rested. The great codification of the Anglican principle is, of course, Hooker's Of the Laws of Ecclesiasticall Polity, and it is notable that he could not work it out there without questioning the doctrine of Absolute Predestination. As in art, form follows function in this development. The function that the monarchy and tradition dictated for the English Church dictated the form it assumed. And this form had to develop for itself an ideology, a theological doctrine to justify that form.

The principal ingredient of English Arminianism in its beginnings, then, where I am to take hold of it, is the attack on the High Calvinist doctrine of Absolute Predestination. The intellectual side of this revolt I have tried to indicate cursorily in the preceding pages. Theologically it took form in disputes over a denial of the perseverance of the saints, an assertion of the doctrine of the freedom of man's will in the process of regeneration, and a substitution of God's foreknowledge for God's absolute will in the doctrine of predestination. It never loses hold of the doctrine of predestination as such, nor of the doctrine of original sin.

As at the beginning, so at the end, Professor Woodhouse says:

> In Puritan pamphlets the term 'Arminian' is loosely used to designate the whole Laudian position, but usually with some reference to the attitude on predestination which was felt to be basic. 1

The history of the doctrine of predestination is a work of a lifetime in itself, It may perhaps be seen as the theological form of a great dichotomy that emerges in all eras, all philosophies, and all religions, primitive and sophisticated. It is only roughly contained in the terms fatalism and freedom of the will. It is the stuff of the very beginnings of theological formulation of Christian doctrine, in the conflict of the Greek Fathers with Gnosticism, and its reestablishment as a doctrine of the Church in the battle with Pelagius is the great accomplishment of Augustine.

---

1 Puritanism and Liberty, page [54], note.

Both Calvin and Luther considered as central to the Reformation the assertion of the doctrine of grace against the 'Pelagianism' which had crept into the Roman Church. A split parallel to the Calvinist-Arminian in the Reformed churches takes place in the Catholic Church, notably between the Jesuits and the Jansenists in France. Calvin began his statement of the doctrine with the early editions of the _Institutes_ only in the terms of 'predentination to life'. Although he later added the terms of reprobation, he never really thought of that aspect as an important part of and a necessary consequence to the principle with which he began: the Absolute Will of God. He insists on the inefficacy of works, and the total efficiency of grace. Man can do absolutely nothing to redeem himself; redemption comes only from the choosing of God: His predestination. For him Fortune and Chance "are words of the heathen..."[1] what happens happens by the Will of God. He did not, however, consider predestination a central doctrine. It became that with his successors, notably Beza, and with the Protestant scholasticism which worked out the various schools of supra-, sub-, and pre-lapsarian predestination. Theologians have been unable to decide, on the basis of his writings, exactly which of these doctrines Calvin would have favored. The supra-lapsarians had some very pertinent quotations to offer from the Institutes to prove that he was of their conviction. He calls it an 'awful decree':

---

[1] John Calvin, _Institutes of the Christian Religion_, I, xxvi, 8. Calvin's first mention of it, says McGiffert (_Protestant Thought Before Kant_, New York, 1931) was merely as a necessary accompaniment to the doctrine of salvation by faith alone. In the 1539 edition of the Institutes however, he gave a special chapter to reprobation. McGiffert ascribes this to the influence of Bucer.

> It is an awful decree, I confess, but no one can deny that God foreknew the future final fate of man before he created him, and that he did foreknow it because it was appointed by his own decree. 1

It is this extension of Calvinism against which the protest comes. Its outlines will appear more clearly in the course of my recital; I think it needs no more elaboration here, except for a concise definition of the various -lapsarians.

> The fundamental Supralapsarian position... is virtually identical with this one - that we ought to conceive of God as first decreeing to manifest His character in saving some men and consigning the rest to misery; then, in sequence and subordination to this decree, resolving to create man, and to permit him to fall into a state of sin; while the fundamental Sublapsarian position is, that we ought to conceive of God as first decreeing to create man and to permit him to fall, and then as resolving to save some man out of this fallen and corrupt mass, and leave the rest to perish. 2

---

1 Ibid., III, xxiii, 7.

2 William Cunningham, The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation, Edinburgh, 1866, page 360.
This, it may be said, is a late Calvinistic definition of the positions. In the seventeenth century, the Supralapsarian theory held that the decree included sin, so that God had to be conceived of as decreeing the Fall so that He could accomplish salvation. The Infralapsarian position then developed, in which the Fall was connected with the permission of God rather than His foreordination. "The Divine decree takes the existence of sin for granted, deals with man as fallen, and elects or rejects him for reasons profoundly indifferent to human judgment." (Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, New York, 1908, "Arminianism").

The pre-lapsarians hold that man was permitted to fall because he chose to fall by the sin of Adam, and that the election of some to life and some to death is nevertheless still of the sheer will of God.

The best illustration of the English doctrine of predestination, and the rationalization of it, is probably the Catechism (mentioned in the preceding chapter) which was bound up with the English Geneva Bible from 1579 to 1615. (I reproduce it in a somewhat condensed form.)[1]

> "Q. Why do men so much vary in Matters of Religion?
>
> A. Because all have not the like Measure of Knowledge, Neither do all believe the Gospel of Christ.
>
> Q. What is the Reason thereof?
>
> A. Because they only believe the Gospel and Doctrine of Christ, which are ordained unto Eternal Life.
>
> Q. Are not all ordained unto Eternal Life?
>
> A. Some are Vessels of Wrath, ordained unto Destruction; as others are Vessels of Mercy, prepared to Glory.
>
> Q. How standeth it with Gods Justice, that some are appointed unto Damnation?
>
> A. Very well: Because all Men have in themselves sin: which deserveth no less. And therefore the Mercy of God is wonderful, in that he vouchsafeth to save some of that sinful Race, and to bring them to the Knowledge of the Truth.
>
> Q. [If it is fore-ordained, why care?] For he that liveth well, must needs be damned, if he be thereunto ordained: And he that liveth ill must needs be saved, if he be thereunto appointed.
>
> A. Not so: for it is not possible, that either the Elect should always be without Care to do well, or that the Reprobate should have any will thereunto. For to have either good Will, or good Work is a Testimony of the Spirit of God; which is given to the Elect only: whereby Faith is so wrought in them, that being grafted in Christ, they grow in Holiness to that Glory, whereunto they are appointed. Neither are they so vain, as once to think that they may do as they list themselves, because they are Predestinate unto Salvation. But rather they endeavour to walk in such good Works, as God

---

[1] Strype's Annals, III, p. 49, Appendix Number XXVI.

in Christ Jesus hath ordained them unto, and prepared for them to be occupied in, to their own Comfort, Stay and Assurance; and to his Glory.

Q. But how shall I know?

A. [By the motions of spiritual Life.]...which belongeth only to the Children of God. By the which that Life is perceived: even as the Life of this Body is discerned by the Sense and Motions thereof.

Q. What mean you by the Motions of Spiritual Life?

A. [Remorse, Love of Righteousness, etc. demonstrate it.]

Q. Cannot such perish, as at some time or other feel these Motions within themselves?

A. It is not possible that they should. For as God's Purpose is not changeable, so he repenteth not the Gifts and Graces of his adoption. Neither doth he cast off those whom he hath once received.

Q. Why then should we pray by the Example of David, that he cast us not from his Face, and that he take not his Holy Spirit from us?

A. In so praying we make Protestation of the Weakness of Flesh, which moveth us to doubt. Yet should not we have courage to ask, if we were not assured, that God will give according to his Purpose and Promise, that which we require.

Q. [Do the children of God feel it all alike?]

A. No, truly...Yet the Spirit of Adoption is never taken from them, that have once received it; else might they perish....

Q. What if I never feel these Motions in myself, shall I despair, and think myself a Castaway?

A. God forbid. For God calleth his at what time he seeth good....

Q. By what means useth God to draw men to himself, that they may be saved?

A. By the preaching of his Word, and the Ministring of the Sacraments thereunto annexed &c...."

CHAPTER FOUR

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES

Traces of dissension on the subject of predestination and free-will in the early Elizabethan Church are hard to find. In general the agreement is almost complete. The Elizabethans' interest from the beginning is in completing the Reformation from Rome, and their concentration is on questions of justification by faith, of the Real Presence in the Eucharist and other doctrines more central to the original movements of the Reformation. Solidarity on predestination was the more necessary after the Council of Trent had made something like semi-Pelagianism the orthodox doctrine of Rome, and the Jesuits had made it their basic doctrine not to exalt the power of divine grace so much as to attenuate free-will. There was some disagreement in the early days. Under Edward, Bishop Hooper was attacked by Bartholomew Traheron for not being exactly orthodox[1] in this respect. There is a constant process of progressive rigidity on the question, from what evidence can be adduced, although I must again emphasize that by far the most of the discussion was about questions of discipline rather than doctrine. In a letter dated September 10, 1552 Traheron asks Bullinger what his views are on predestination. Some people are saying, he informs Bullinger, that "you lean too much to Melanchthon's views." He and most of them in England, he tells him, lean to Calvin's. The answer he received from Bullinger was evidently unsatisfactory, for he writes a vigorous disagreement the next year (June 3, 1553). "And unless we allow this [that God not only foresaw the fall but arranged it]", he says, "we shall certainly take away both the providence and the wisdom of God altogether."[1] And Jewel writes to Peter Martyr at Zurich in 1572, after the final revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles:

---

[1] See Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, pp. 368-369. John ab Ulmis writes to Bullinger April 30, 1550 (Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, ed., Hastings Robinson, Parker Society, two volumes, Cambridge, 1846-1847, I, 406-407.): "But I am not able to conjecture how far your commendatory letter respecting Alexander would avail with Hooper and Traheron: for it is wonderful how very far they disagree respecting God's predestination of man;..." But on August 22d he notes that the quarrel has been settled.

> As to matters of doctrine, we have pared every thing away to the very quick, and do not differ from you by a nail's breadth;...[2]

The bare doctrine of predestination to life, however, and the denial that the will had any freedom to do good was enough for them. A typical orthodox statement of it is in one of the sermons of Bishop Sandys before the Queen. He says:

---

[1] Page 327.

[2] Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, three volumes, New York, 1878, I, 603.
One of the main elements of the later Arminian argument, seen at length in Heylyn's *Aerius Redivivus*, (1670) is a lengthy attempt to establish the original Arminianism of the Church of England by quoting from Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and other early Churchmen. Hunt's answer to these arguments is probably the best one. (*Religious Thought in England*, I, 33 n.) "It is a question that has been keenly discussed between Calvinists and Arminians, which side could claim Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper. If the question were to be determined by the general tone and spirit of their writings, there can be no doubt that they were Calvinists. But the task of proving their Calvinism to those who question it, is not so easy." I shall discuss the points of this attempt later on in this chapter, but on the whole, as Hunt says, these were not questions which they felt at the time they had to discuss directly.

> No doubt we have power and free will to run from God; but to draw near unto him is his grace and gift. *Ad malum sufficit sibi liberum arbitrium, ad bonum non*, 'Free will hath in itself ability enough to evil, but not to Good'. [the quotation is from Augustine]. He commandeth us therefore to do that, which of ourselves we are not able to do; that, seeing our want, we may crave his grace and help, which will enable us to draw near unto him....[1]

Probably the most authoritative statement of the doctrine of the Church of England in the late sixteenth century is the work of Bancroft's chaplain Thomas Rogers, which he called *An Exposition on the 39 Articles of the Church of England*. It first appeared as *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England*[2] in 1579, and continued to be published up until 1607 in various editions. It is in the form of an interpretation of the Articles, and the tenor of his interpretation may be deduced from the fact that Prynne and the other anti-Arminians of the next century cite him at length to justify their claim that the church has always been High Calvinist. They also cite, of course, the fact that he was Bancroft's chaplain. Under the seventeenth article, of Predestination, he cites as Proposition three, to be believed from this article, that "They which are predestinate unto salvation cannot perish." He adds later: "Wander then do they from the truth which think That the very elect, totally and finally, may fall from grace, and be damned....That the number of those which be predestinate may both increase and be diminished: so thought the Pelagians." And among the "errors and adversaries unto" the truth of Proposition Five: ("In Christ Jesus, of the mere will and purpose of God, some are elected, and not others, unto salvation"), he affirms that it is an error to believe that: "God beheld in every man whether he would use his grace well, and believe the gospel or no; and as he saw a man affected, so he did predestinate, choose, or refuse him." This is the praevisa fides which only appears late in the course of English Arminianism, which we have already seen mentioned in Burton. It is an error of the Papists, he says, that man can make himself eligible for the Kingdom of God by good works. He can still hold, however, that: "The promises of grace and favour to mankind are universal:..." which is to be the basis for attack on predestination later on. It does not occur to this Elizabethan that there is any contradiction there, and indeed, in theological terms, there is none. But the more philosophical minds of English Humanism are going to gag at that paradox.

---

[1] *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D.D.*, ed., John Ayre, The Parker Society, Cambridge, 1841, p. 133.

[2] Ed., J. J. S. Perowne, Cambridge, The Parker Society, 1854.

Two examples may suffice for this introduction to the way the Puritans took this doctrine. The First Admonition to Parliament complains that the English service prays that all men may be saved "without exception; and that travelling by sea and land may be preserved, Turks and traitors not excepted..." "In all their service there is no edification, they pray that all men may be saved." The basis for the complaint is obviously that the consequences of the doctrine of predestination are not carried out in the services of the church. In 1588 John Udall contributed to the Marprelate Tracts a book entitled The State of the Church of England Laide Open in a Conference between Diotrephes, a Byshop, Tertullus, a Papist, etc. in which the following exchange takes place:

> Diotrephes: 'Doe you not also like of the preaching of predestination?'
> Paul: ['a preacher of the Word of God'] 'Yea, or els should I dislike of preaching the trueth, for it is a part of God's revealed will.'
> Dio.:'So do not I in these daies, when there be so manye weake ones, I thinke it to be a very break-necke of all religion.'
> Paul:'I have hearde of freewil men that have saide so, but I never heard man of learning affirme it, but one that was a byshoppe in a sermon, but his wordes were no lesse than blasphemie, and so are yours, and al they that say or think the same are guiltie of no lesse sinne.'[1]

One or two incidents involving bishops in the Elizabethan church reveal that there was scattered disagreement on basic doctrines. Richard Cox, who was Bishop of Ely from 1559 to 1581, is credited by Usher with being responsible for Bancroft's turn from Calvinism. Bancroft began his career by being chaplain to Cox, who led the conservative opposition to the first Puritans in the troubles at Frankfort during the Marian exile. But Cox was never attacked for his doctrines, as far as I have been able to find, although he was complained about for racking his tenants,[2] and Elizabeth was not satisfied with his toleration of 'prophesyings'. Usher says of him that he had been

---

[1] Ed., Edward Arber, London, 1879, p..14.
[2] Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 220.

> ...as a young man one of the first radical reformers in England, and had then been an advocate of extreme ideas. He had however not been able to accept Calvinism, and had been the antagonist of the redoubtable Knox at Frankfort during their exile. In fact, hostile to both Geneva and Rome, he was a true pupil of Cranmer, filled with that spirit of compromise and moderation which has always marked the English Church. Probably just at this moment, when Bancroft was without any very settled ideas on theological problems, but inclining toward Calvinism, the influence of the learned and venerable prelate was decisive. [1]

Richard Cheyney (1513-1579) who was made Bishop of Gloucester in 1562, and was removed in 1571 for his views, is the one great exception to the uniform Calvinism of the Elizabethan Bishops of the early generation. He was the object of attack more for his views on the Eucharist, however, than for anything else. He was one of the scholars who argued against transubstantiation in the debate held by royal command in Convocation in 1553, but he was not molested, and continued to hold his archdeaconry, during Mary's reign. He was given the see of Gloucester, and that of Bristol *in commendam*, upon Elizabeth's accession. He took them reluctantly, since he was engaged in a kind of itinerant missionary work in the provinces at the time. The Puritans in Bristol complained of him loudly as a Papist and Free-Willer, since he had arrived at a doctrine of consubstantiation which that he had been

---

[1] *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, I, 29. For Usher, however, to be Anglican in discipline is to be non-Calvinist in doctrine; this is an assumption which is unjustified in Elizabethan church history.

> ...as a young man one of the first radical reformers in England, and had then been an advocate of extreme ideas. He had however not been able to accept Calvinism, and had been the antagonist of the redoubtable Knox at Frankfort during their exile. In fact, hostile to both Geneva and Rome, he was a true pupil of Cranmer, filled with that spirit of compromise and moderation which has always marked the English Church. Probably just at this moment, when Bancroft was without any very settled ideas on theological problems, but inclining toward Calvinism, the influence of the learned and venerable prelate was decisive. 1

Richard Cheyney (1513-1579) who was made Bishop of Gloucester in 1562, and was removed in 1571 for his views, is the one great exception to the uniform Calvinism of the Elizabethan Bishops of the early generation. He was the object of attack more for his views on the Eucharist, however, than for anything else. He was one of the scholars who argued against transubstantiation in the debate held by royal command in Convocation in 1553, but he was not molested, and continued to hold his archdeaconry, during Mary's reign. He was given the see of Gloucester, and that of Bristol in commendam, upon Elizabeth's accession. He took them reluctantly, since he was engaged in a kind of itinerant missionary work in the provinces at the time. The Puritans in Bristol complained of him loudly as a Papist and Free-Willer, since he had arrived at a doctrine of consubstantiation which

---

[1] The Reconstruction of the English Church, I, 29. For Usher, however, to be Anglican in discipline is to be non-Calvinist in doctrine; this is an assumption which is unjustified in Elizabethan church history.

outraged the Calvinists as much as transubstantiation. They accused him to the Privy Council for sermons he preached in 1568 in which he said that the authority of the Fathers in doctrine was to be preferred above that of Calvin, and spoke slightingly of the theologians of the day. Archbishop Parker took Bristol away from him at that time, and in 1571 Convocation excommunicated him for absenting himself when he was cited to appear to answer charges that he had repudiated Calvinistic views of free-will. When he pleaded illness he was absolved, but the diocese was taken out of his hands.[1]

The only other challenge to Calvinistic predestination that is of record in the sixteenth century, until Baro's, is that represented by the group called the Free-Willers who were imprisoned with some of the Puritans during Mary's reign. Knappen calls them "halfway Anabaptists"[2]; Champlin Burrage calls them "merely Nonconformists (in the early meaning of that term)" of a rather peculiar type,[3] while to Archbishop Laurence in the early nineteenth century[4] they were the forerunners of the true Church of England. They held conventicles in Essex and in Kent, and admitted (when they were interrogated by the Privy Council in 1550)[5] that they had not communicated in the Church of England for more than two years. But they also denied stoutly that they were Anabaptists, and the fact that people of their views felt that they must separate themselves from the church is strong evidence of the essential Calvinism of the church even before the Marian exile. In their examination before the Privy Council one Cole of Feversham was said to have asserted that the doctrine of predestination was 'meeter for devils than for Christian men.' Another was reported to have said that God did not predestinate men to election or reprobation but that their fate depended solely upon themselves. There are certain hints in their doctrine of the later attack that the first Arminians will make upon the doctrine of the certain perseverance of the Saints. Part of the transcript reads thus:

---

[1] F. O. White, Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops, London, 1898, pp. 172-177. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James, p. 163.

[2] Tudor Puritanism, p. 149.

[3] The Early English Dissenters, two volumes, Cambridge, 1912, I, 51.

[4] Richard Laurence, An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England, which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinisticall...., Oxford, the Bampton Lectures, 1805.

[5] Burrage, I, 53.

> Laurentius Ramsaye Item Examyned apon the xth article saithe that henry harte saide and affirmed as it is conteyned in tharticle that is that ther is no man so chosen or predestynate but that he maye condempne hime selfe. Nether is ther anye so reprobate but that he maye if he will kepe the commandementes and be salvid prout liquet in suis depositionibus. 1

And in further depositions they affirm a rather full doctrine of conditional predestination.

Professor Knappen assumes that the Free-Willers who were imprisoned in King's Bench under Mary were of this same group, although there are no certain evidences that this is so. There was a series of arguments and disagreements between them and the more conventional Nonconformists, recorded by

---

1 Burrage prints them, II, 1-6.

one John Trew, one of the Free-Willers, in a manuscript now in the Bodleian Library.[1] In addition, Heylyn in his *Quinquarticular History*[2] gives the substance of an interrogation of Careless, a Puritan, a weaver of Coventry, by one Dr. Martin, a deputy of the Queen. Careless[3] affirms that God, through Jesus Christ "...did elect and appoint in him before the foundation of the earth was laid, a Church or congregation which he doth continually guide, and govern by his Grace and Holy Spirit, so that not one of them all ever finally perish." He says that the Free-Willers like Trew believe that we are elect so long as we do good works and no longer. This is hardly fair to their position, since Trew's list of what has given the Predestinarians such offense phrases it thus:

> ...That Christ died for all men, we do by the holy Scripture satisfy every man, that doth repent, and unfeignedly believe with a lively faith, that he is in the state of salvation, and one of God's elect children, and shall certainly be saved, if he do not with malice of heart utterly forsake God....

He accuses the Predestinarians of the error of the Manichees, of believing "that there is a nature or motion to evil in God;" of making God the author of sin, and of frustrating in their doctrine the will of God, by teaching that the elect cannot perish finally whatever they do. Strype reprints "A Letter to the Congregation of Freewillers, by one that had been of that persuasion, but come off, and now a Prisoner for Religion"[1], who is wrestling with the contradiction of the words of Paul and James on faith and works which was to bemuse so many after him in the Arminian-Predestinarian battle. He too holds that none of the elect can ever fall away. This follows a rather cooler letter of a Freewill man who justifies his beliefs on the classic basis that man is higher than the beasts. God has ordained that man do all things out of his Free Will, "and therefore for man is the Day of Judgment sette, and not for the unreasonable Creatures."

---

[1] John Trew, "The Cause of Contention in the King's Bench", Bodleian MS. 53, fols. 116-124. This has been reprinted by Richard Laurence in his *Authentic Documents Relative to the Predestinarian Controversy*, Oxford, 1819, pp. 37-70, "Inaccurately" according to Professor Knappen. The book does not seem to be available in this country. I have used a microfilm of the MS.

[2] In *ΚΕΙΜΗΛΙΑ* *'ΕΚΚΛΝΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΑ*. *The Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts of the Reverend and Learned Peter Heylyn, D.D.*, London, 1681, - *Historia Quinquarticularis*, Chapter xvii.

[3] The Puritan interpretation of election at this point, however, made them anything but the conventional concept of Puritan. The Free-Willers looked with horror on their "gaming" and "dicing"; their attitude was that since they were elect, works did not matter.

However for the future rebels against predestination these were lost voices. We hear no traces of them when the battle begins within the Church thirty years later. As Professor Knappen says, this movement was "overwhelmed by the waves of predestinarian orthodoxy which rolled in from the Continent in the early years of Elizabeth's reign."[2]

There is no doubt, then, that the English Reformation, however it began, doctrinally, was guided by overt intention, after the Marian exile, in Calvinistic lines, and that the impetus toward a completion of the process of reformation which is behind the Puritan drive on the Church in matters of discipline, also inspired a drive toward a progressive heightening and narrowing of the dogmatic basis of official doctrine. The latitude of the Thirty-Nine Articles distresses the Calvinists from the beginning, and yet they still do not manifest the perfect assurance about the official doctrine of the Church which we should expect from men who are professedly enforcing old doctrine, not making new. William Whitaker, for instance, in making his charges of heresy against Barrett in one of his first letters to Whitgift, feels he must hedge. Barrett's doctrines, says Whitaker, are "...if not against the Articles, yet against the Religion of our Church, publicly received."[1] My study of the Lambeth Articles and the maneuvers surrounding them has convinced me that the formulation of them was a deliberate policy of the same central command that was behind the first movements toward reform and the Conventicles of the 1580's. It seems apparent from the evidence, as I have put it together in the following pages, that when the first wave of protest broke against Bancroft's hasty but effective defences, and the lunatic fringe discredited the whole movement by its recourse to the tactics of the Marprelate tracts, the reformers' tactics were to turn to questions of doctrine in which they could enlist more respected and respectable names like Whitaker and

---

[1] Historical Memorials..., London, 1721, III, No. XLIII.
[2] Tudor Puritanism, p. 151.

---

[1] John Strype, The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, three volumes, Oxford, 1822, III, 338.

Perkins, with the hope of narrowing the Articles to a degree where they could then demand Presbyterian polity as the only one suited to carrying out the demands of such doctrines.[1]

For the purposes of my more inclusive conclusions, the importance of the Lambeth Articles lies in their revelation of the strength of English liberal doctrine, stemming from the whole attitude of Renaissance humanism, at a time when everything seems united on the side of the defenders of the doctrinal *status quo*. Baro and the party he represents criticize High Calvinism on moral terms, from humanistic and philosophic positions. To them it is determinism and takes away the freedom of man's will. Hooker at the same time is writing his defence of the Church in terms of a concept of reason and law, but doctrinally, as I shall demonstrate, he begins from the same critique of High Calvinism. Baro does not concern himself so much with the doctrine of the Church, but his was the doctrine which underpropped the great defence of that institution that Whitgift and Hooker made. The history of that running battle has been written in terms of political theory and forms of church discipline, but the doctrinal cannot be left out. Milton summarized the way the men of the time viewed the two in his comment in *Of Reformation* written in 1641:

---

[1] In fact, of course, if we take Hardwick's date for the first conventicle as 1567 (Charles Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion*, Cambridge and London, 1859, p. 192.) it can be said that the Puritan protests were in the beginning both doctrinal and disciplinarian, for the attack on Baro began in 1580.

> ...albeit in purity of Doctrine we with our
> Bretheren; yet in Discipline, which is the
> execution and applying of Doctrine home...
> we are no better than a Schisme from all
> the Reformation, and a sore scandall to them...

I have been led to conclude that there is a far closer relationship than has generally been realized between this liberal doctrinal party and Hooker, and I think I have solved one of the problems which has plagued church historians since the seventeenth century: that of the true doctrinal position of Whitgift. No one has been quite able to account for the fact that the man upon whom the Calvinists of the whole seventeenth and eighteenth centuries fathered the supposedly High Calvinist Lambeth Articles, could also have been the patron and instigator of the unorthodox and liberal Hooker and Bancroft. The answer is that the Lambeth Articles as they finally appeared represented a liberal modification of what the High Calvinists originally proposed. I have also put in its proper place in the history of the Lambeth Articles a piece of evidence that comes out in one of the letters of Grotius: that Lancelot Andrewes was one of the makers of the Articles, and was present at the conference which finally approved them, and that in 1613 he had the minutes of the meeting which promulgated the Lambeth Articles in his possession.

It is safe, then, I think, to assume that the doctrinal offensive by the High Calvinists which led to the making of the Lambeth Articles represents a phase of the second wave of Puritan disciplinarian attacks on the Church. The first important one had arisen and been partially put down in the 1580's. The second was met with the Conventicle Act and Hooker's Ecclesiasticall Polity.[1] The first four books of the Polity touched lightly on doctrine, but the Fifth Book, which appeared in 1597, carried Hooker into more doctrinal questions, and his position on predestination had been well known since his quarrels with Travers in the Temple in the preceding decade. The import of these doctrines X must have been well[2] known in theological circles long before their publication, and they must have played a part in the decision of the High Calvinists to make their demands the official doctrine of the Church before the liberals got too far along in their modification of it. The fact that the proposers of the Lambeth Articles were more successful than the disciplinary innovators comes no doubt from the fact that they included, as I have noted, several stout defenders of the Church as it was then organized. They were finally defeated, however, by Elizabeth's personal aversion to Calvinist doctrine, and by her shrewdness in detecting in time what this narrowing of doctrine would do to the Erastianism which she looked upon as the only means to save her realm from the horrors of religious strife. The final split of doctrine from discipline was not to come for fifty years, but the Lambeth Articles began it; the defence of episcopal polity was drawing doctrinal 'novelty' along with it and only confirming the Puritans' worst fears.[1]

---

[1] C. J. Sisson points out, in The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker, Cambridge, 1940, that the publication of the first four Books of the Polity, now established to be in 1593, was by all indications part of a carefully worked-out legislative program with the Conventicle Act of that year.

[2] Hooker was sending his manuscript for criticism and correction to Cranmer and Sandys as he finished each section, and we know also that he had at least planned to send the MS. of the Fifth Book to Rainolds for similar comment.

That Hooker was in close touch with the situation we gather from a very interesting comment from the mouth of Lancelot Andrewes more than twenty years later, when the Lambeth Articles were again an issue in the Dutch Arminian battle. John Chamberlain writes to Sir Dudley Carleton from London on October 31, 1617:

> Upon the receipt of your letter of the 19th of this present, I went to the Bishop of Ely, whom I had not seen long before his going into Scotland, nor since he was councillor. I was very welcome to him, and he used me with extraordinary kindness, though he expostulated with me very much for my long absence. I delivered him your proposition, and, withal, upon long conference, somewhat you had written touching the Armenians [sic] countenancing themselves with some of his letters. Whereupon he fell into long speech of a writing that the Archbishop Whitgift got from him in some

---

[1] The coordination of the disciplinary and doctrinal attacks may be deduced from two more bits of evidence: Strype makes the point (*Whitgift*, II, 226-228,) that the Barrett case is "a new contention", coming after the disciplinarian attacks he has just finished describing. This would be second-hand evidence and opinion, except for the fact that he quotes from Dr. Andrew Willet in his dedicatory epistle to Whitgift before his *Synopsis Papismi*, who says that the Puritans were now quiet but "that though the domestic controversies with which this Church of England had for a long while been disturbed, but were now composed, the ancient contentions were renewed and grew up again, *viz.* those of free-will, hypothetical election, universal grace &c., and the like questions, which were now so hotly disputed." And Baro connects it, quite as if it were to be assumed, with the Puritan quarrel, at the end of his letter to Whitgift written at the height of the battle, on December 13, 1595: (Strype's *Whitgift*, II, 289.) As Strype recounts it, he said "...that he hoped his [Whitgift's] humanity would have respect to his labours: who had there spent his age for twenty years for a very small stipend, and had been variously vexed by them who were not so well pleased with the state of this Church."

> parts of that argument, and that he knows not what became of it, for he never gave copy of it, but one only to Mr. Hooker, who promised to return it, but never did....[1]

The significance of the other facts in this letter I shall discuss in their place, but 'that argument' can only refer to the Lambeth Articles, and the 'writing' can only be "Bishop Andrewes' Judgment of the Lambeth Articles",[2] which probably first appeared in print in the Articuli Lambethani, of 1651, but which must have been circulated widely in manuscript before that. It is enough to remark here that Hooker was closely interested in what was being done in this matter. He himself was to be the object of a bitter personal attack, also on doctrinal grounds, in the Christian Letter[3] of 1599, and in the answer he prepared but never published he explicitly modified the terms of the Lambeth Articles himself.[4]

---

[1] The Court and Times of James I, ed., Thomas Birch, II, 47.

[2] Printed in A Pattern of Catechisticall Doctrine and other Minor Works of Lancelot Andrewes, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford, 1846, II, 289-300.

[3] Its full title: "A Christian Letter of certaine English Protestants, unfained favourers of the present state of Religion, authorized and professed in England: unto that Reverend and learned man, Mr. R. Hoo. requiring resolution in certain matters of doctrine (which seeme to overthrow the foundation of Christian Religion, and of the Church among us) expreslie contained in his five books of Ecclesiastical Policie." See Keble's Hooker, I, ix ff.

[4] I shall discuss this subject at more length in its place. The presence of this "writing" I think accounts for the great anxiety Andrewes shows for the protection of the contents of Hooker's study after his death. He writes to a friend urging him to see to it that Hooker's papers "...come not into greate hands, whoe will only have use of them quatenus & quousque...." See R. A. Houk, Hooker's Ecclesiasticall Polity, Book VIII, New York, 1931, p. 113.

I have thus concluded that although it is Baro and Barrett who are immediately concerned in the tactical maneuvers of the events I am about to summarize, the real object of the whole uprising against them was to broaden the front of the contemporary attack on Church discipline. By so doing the Puritans could make their movement again respectable, and gain a numerical preponderance in the Church. One of the great objectives of the Anglicans is thus revealed to be their attempt to keep the quarrel on points of discipline, to keep doctrine out of it and thus keep the Puritans in the Church. Only on this hypothesis can we account for the extraordinary reticence Lancelot Andrewes practised on debatable points of doctrine such as predestination all through his career, and it is a large part of the explanation for Whitgift's puzzling doctrinal position, of which I spoke above.[1] Whitgift, like Hooker, had not been without sympathy for the Puritan faction when he was at the University. In 1565 he joined in signing a letter to Cecil from the Heads at Cambridge against Parker's

---

[1] The process leading to the final split between discipline and doctrine was slow. On March 19, 1604, James, in opening Parliament speaks of "...the Puritans and novelists" as "a sect rather than a religion,...who differ not so much in points of religion as in their confused form of policy and parity, being ever discontented with the present form of government." (Cited from *Lords Journals*, II, 264, STC 14390, by G. B. Harrison in *A Jacobean Journal*, New York, 1941, p. 114.) And the book by William Bradshaw, *English Puritanism*, which came out in 1605 (STC 3516), centers entirely on discipline. James' responsibility for the events after his reign is seen in the fact that he began the process of refusing to allow the two to be taken separately. Fuller reports his words at the Hampton Court Conference thus: (*Church History*, Book x) "*I* will not argue that point [the sign of the cross in baptism] with you, but

Advertisements which began the enforcement of the wearing of vestments.[1] Whitgift took a less liberal view than Cartwright of the chances for salvation of the Fathers who believed in free-will,[2] and yet it was Whitgift who was Hooker's patron and continued to support him when he was attacked by Travers for being unorthodox in the doctrine of predestination and for holding that the Fathers who were unorthodox might also be saved. He is an excellent example of the truth of one of the principles that underlay the Puritan attacks on discipline: defence of an Episcopal polity will inevitably draw the Church into unorthodox doctrines. But the social fabric was more important for the Elizabethan churchman than the most basic doctrines, and Whitgift accepts doctrinal grounds for the defence of

---

answer as kings in parliament, *Le roy s'avisera*. This is like Mr. John Black, a beardless boy, who told me the last conference in Scotland that he would hold conformity with his majesty in matters of doctrine, but every man for ceremonies was to be left to his own liberty. But I will have none of that; I will have one doctrine, one discipline, one religion, in substance and in ceremony. Never speak more to that point, how far you are bound to obey."

[1] James Bass Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, three volumes, Cambridge, 1884, II, 198. He was fellow of Peterhouse and Lady Margaret Professor at the time. One of the other signers was Matthew Hutton, whom as Archbishop of York, Whitgift consulted about the Lambeth Articles.

[2] Cartwright had written: "For I doubt not but divers of the fathers of the Greek Church, which were great patrons of free-will, are saved, holding the foundation of the faith which is Christ. The like might be said of a number of other, as necessary doctrines as that, wherein men being misled have notwithstanding been saved." To which Whitgift's marginal comment had been: "He that dieth in the opinion of free-will holdeth not this foundation. Why then have not you done it, speaking so dangerously?" Hooker and other Anglicans were later to be bitterly attacked by the Puritans for holding exactly the same doctrine: that the heathen and Fathers might be saved, even if their doctrines were not exactly what the Puritans held. (*The Defense of the Aunswere ...against the Replie of T.C.*, Whitgifts *Works*, Parker Society, I, 189.)

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

the Church as an institution which he would never entertain as a theologian. His acceptance of the Lambeth Articles, then, is not against his doctrinal principles; it represents his attempt to keep the split on discipline from becoming an exactly corresponding split on doctrine. He tries from the beginning of the quarrel at Cambridge to keep the whole question a matter of discipline and jurisdiction. He rebukes the orthodox party for attacking Barrett and instituting disciplinary measures without consulting him, who holds the right of visitation in the University. When they execute a retreat on this matter, and still insist on a prosecution of the doctrinal question, he is forced into a showdown. The result is a compromise in the terms of the time (although the Articles became a synonym for the extremes of High Calvinism), but he discovers he has nevertheless gone too far for the government's tenderness for the latitude of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the Lambeth Articles are effectively made a dead letter.

There is no evading the fact, however, that the Lambeth Articles served their turn. They became a propaganda rallying point for the theological arguments that preceded the Civil War; they inhibited the development and liberalization of Anglican doctrine until Laud. Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall must be continually on their guard against attacks that may be launched upon their views from behind the Lambeth Articles, and these articles are the bulwark of the opposition which defeats the mission of Grotius and puts down the Remonstrants in the Netherlands. The Lambeth Articles may even be said to be responsible for the extremes of Laudianism, since the doctrinal break with Calvinism that finally had to be made had to be so much more violent.

The circumstances of their inception, however, were debatable enough to give both sides material for argument. The Puritans who attacked the Laudian Church for corrupting the old religion of England pointed to them as proof of the Calvinism of the Elizabethan Church. Prynne, Burton, Rous, Yates and Carleton all cite them in this way against Montague. Heylyn and Montague point to the fact that they were never approved by Convocation, that they were suppressed by the government, and called in by Whitgift, and that Elizabeth even had threatened Whitgift with a Praemunire for having allowed them to be made. When, after the Restoration, there began the process of justifying the full doctrine and polity of the Laudian Church, the claim had to be sustained that Apostolic Succession, Divine Right of Bishops and Arminian theology had always been the doctrine of the Elizabethan Church, and evermore would be. Part of this campaign was to picture the largest influence in the writing of the Thirty-Nine Articles as Lutheran. Montague, in beginning the argument in print[1] in his Appello Caesarem (1625), explicitly denies having claimed that the Church of England was in agreement with the Lutherans even in the terms in which the latter attacked, as he did, 'the doctrine of absolute and irrespective

---

[1] As I shall show in discussing Grotius in England, the same argument had been used by Andrewes in conversation with Grotius, and by other Englishmen upon whose opinions Grotius reports, but they did not dare to write it down.

Election'. But, he claims, this doctrine

> ...hath been prohibited to be enjoyned and tendred, or maintained as the Authenticall Doctrine of our Church, by Supreme Authority, with sharp reproof unto those that went about to have it tendred, then, when those Conclusions or Assertions of Lambeth, as they are called in the Conference of Hampton Court, were upon sending downe to the Universitie of Cambridge.... [1]

Heylyn and Hickman bandy the same arguments on each side back and forth between them after the Restoration, Heylyn being the first to come out boldly with the claim that the Thirty-Nine Articles owed more to Lutheran models of doctrine than to Calvinist.[2] Hunt's nineteenth-century answer to this point of view is correct in his conclusion, but he is wrong on two of the facts which he cites to support them. He says:

> Towards the end of the reign of King James the doctrines of Arminius began to find favor among the clergy of the Church of England. Hitherto Calvin was the idol theologian. Those who say that the Church of England is not Calvinistic in doctrine have but two arguments that have even

---

[1] Page 71.

[2] For a complete theological discussion of this point, and a list of the writers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who defended the thesis of Lutheran influence, see Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, I, 637. He gives Archbishop Laurence, who, as I noted above, tried to include also the Free-Willers of the 1550's in the Anglican family tree, rather less credit than he deserves, in accusing him of not knowing Calvin sufficiently to criticize him. Hooker's criticism of his Puritan opponents for not knowing Calvin well enough to follow him might be applied also to the Calvinists of Dr. Schaff's era, for they take the doctrinal extensions of Calvinism in Beza and the rest of the later generation as pure Calvinism. Schaff is speaking of eighteenth-century Arminianism when he says that it denies Augustinian anthropology. Seventeenth-century Arminianism begins in the attempt to get back to the real Augustine. There is no one more freely invoked than he. They never abandoned the concept of Original Sin, nor the essential elements of predestination.

> the appearance of being plausible. The first is, that our Reformers followed Melanchthon and the Augsburg Confession rather than Calvin. This however was a difference, not in the doctrine itself, but only in adopting a milder form of expressing it. The other is that the Lambeth Articles were rejected at the Hampton Court Conference. To this it is justly answered that the archbishop and bishops who were at the Hampton Court Conference held the same sentiments as the framers of the Lambeth Articles; that James himself was a high Calvinist; and moreover, that the doctrine of the Lambeth Articles was not rejected. The king refused to incorporate them with the organized standards, giving a distinct reason that he would not 'stuff the book withall conclusions theological'. [1]

Hunt's assumption that Arminius was the doctrinal source of English Arminianism is mistaken, and, as we shall see, the interpretation of the Lambeth Articles by the bishops and archbishop at Hampton Court was at variance with the way the Articles had come to be interpreted by the Puritans. And, as we shall also see, James' action in refusing to include them in the Articles was a defeat for the principles which had led to the formation of the Articles in the first place. It is highly significant, and more conclusive evidence than any the 'Lutheran' school has advanced, that the Calvinistic catechism on predestination remained in the English Bible until 1615. It has not been recognized either, I think, that two of the groups into which the translators of the King James version were divided represented the liberal and High Calvinist parties in the church respectively: Westminster and Cambridge. The one at Westminster included Andrewes, Overall, Thomson and Saravia, all of whom will be mentioned below. The Cambridge group had Chaderton and Prideaux. The reason the

---

[1] Religious Thought in England, I, 146 ff.

Arminians were so willing to cooperate in the new translation may well have been that they welcomed a chance to get rid of the Calvinistic influence of the Geneva Bible, but someone saw to it also that the Arminian scholars had the opening books (Genesis to II Kings) for translation.

I am willing to accept, then, as true the fact that both sides in the Elizabethan Church were Calvinistic, but my purpose here is to document the fact that they were not Calvinist in equal degrees. They were moving in two opposite directions: the High Calvinists in the direction of more and stricter dogma, the High Churchmen in the direction of fewer dogmas and more liberal interpretation of the dogmas they had. In defending the status quo the High Churchmen are drawn more and more to liberal theology, but the process is slow. The principles that the Restoration churchmen were trying to defend by interpreting the Elizabethan Settlement as Lutheran were not those of Hooker and Whitgift, and probably not those of Bancroft either.[1] The name and reputation of Hooker were used on the High Church side of this campaign and have continued to be so used (notably by John Keble), but Hooker actually never defended more than the historical validity of the institution of Bishops as such. He elaborately and carefully refrained from espousing the full doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, and what became the doctrine of the Divine Right of Bishops.[2]

---

[1] See Roland G. Usher, "The Supposed Origin of the Divine Right of Bishops", Mélanges d'histoire offerts à M. Charles Bémont, Paris, 1913, pp. 539-547.

[2] The picture we get in Walton's Life is part of this campaign. See my article, "Walton's Redaction of Hooker", Church History, XVII (1948), 95-116.

The fact that the Thirty-Nine Articles deal with predestination at all is indication enough that the Lutheran influence in the English Reformation was subordinate. All Lutheran creeds, except the later Formula of Concord, omit any dealing with it.[1]

It may be well to conclude the mention of this polemical point with the text of those of the Thirty-Nine Articles which the makers of the Lambeth Articles were seeking to define more narrowly. Although the Eleventh and Twelfth Articles are occasionally mentioned, there is no disagreement as to their interpretation; they state the principles upon which the whole Reformation was based: that we are justified by faith alone and not by works. It is the Tenth and the Seventeenth which cause trouble. Part of the sense in which they were taken, however, comes from the context they give to each other, so I shall cite them in sequence.

Article X [English Version, 1571]

> The condition of man after the fall of Adam is suche, that he can not turne and prepare hym selfe by his owne naturall strength and good workes to fayth and calling upon God: Wherefore we have no power to do good workes pleasaunt and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christe preventyng us, that we may have a good wyll, and workyng with us, when we have that good wyll.

Article XI

> We are accompted righteous before God, only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christe, by faith, and not for our owne workes or deseruyngs. Wherefore, that we are iustified by fayth onely, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homilie of iustification.

---

[1] See Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, I, 633.

Article XII

Albeit that good workes which are the fruites of fayth, and follow after iustification, can not put away our sinnes, and endure the seueritie of Gods iudgement: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christe, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively fayth, in so muche that by them, a lyvely fayth may be as evidently knowen, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

Article XVII

Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's [1] promises in such wise as they be generally set

---

[1] It is a measure of the increased Calvinism that came back to England from the Marian exile, that this Article was changed in 1563 by dropping a clause that had been included,

> forth to us in holy Scripture; and, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

Schaff says:

> It must in all fairness be admitted that Article XVII, in connection with Articles X and XIII implies the infralapsarian scheme, and that the Lambeth Articles are not a reaction, but a legitimate though one-sided development.[1]

Whatever the implications, the important fact is that the promulgators of the Lambeth Articles were not content with this statement, and that their opponents were content to let it stand as it was.

We have not here, fortunately, to decide on the merits of the arguments about the theological basis of the Thirty-Nine Articles. I have only to trace the rise of that which was generally agreed at the time was a modification of the High Calvinist interpretation of these articles. I have summarized a little of the issue because two modern treatments of the Lambeth Articles very important for my purposes have been written to add to the evidence for the continuity of the present anti-Calvinist doctrine of the Anglican Church. Mr. W. D. Sargeaunt, in two articles in The Journal of Theological Studies in 1911, analyzed the differences between the version of the Lambeth Articles which was first suggested and that finally adopted, and concluded that they actually represented a modification of High Calvinism.[2] The same conclusions

---

thus: "Furthermore, although the Decrees of Predestination are unknown to us, yet we must receive God's promises... etc." The new scholasticism would no longer accept the fact that anything could be unknown to the inquiring mind.

[1] Creeds of Christendom, I, 637.

[2] "The Lambeth Articles", J. T. S., XII (1911), 251-260; 427-436.

were also arrived at more strongly in 1933 by Beatrice M. Hamilton Thompson, who criticized Sargeaunt for using only Hardwick's History of the Articles for his source. She concluded that the Articuli Lambethani of 1651 was to be depended on as giving the versions of the articles as they were propounded and as they were finally adopted, and on this basis defined the theological implications of both more closely.[1] I agree, after my own investigation of the sources she used, with her theological conclusions, that the modifications introduced into the first version of the Articles show that Whitgift and the bishops were not at the time High Calvinists of the stamp of Whitaker. But her implication that this means that the English Church had from the beginning rejected Calvinism of that rigor, I think is unfounded. And I think that the importance of the Lambeth Articles is just this, that they mark the time when the Church of England had to change its doctrinal bases to save its institutional characteristics. Her conclusions of fact are strengthened by some of the facts which I shall cite below. Lancelot Andrewes told Grotius almost twenty years later that the Articles represented a compromise, and (what seems inconsistent in Strype's account), we know that Baro accepted the articles as orthodox, and was astonished when they were nevertheless invoked against him. But the study of Baro's work, and of the writings and sentiments of Overall and Andrewes at the same time, indicates that there was much more wide activity involved in this quarrel than has been recognized, and, put in a setting of the time, much more of a change in direction for English theology was involved than Miss Thompson will admit. Furthermore, the link between Baro and Bancroft, although it is apparent only in the facts of Baro's funeral, indicates that there was a recognized connection between the doctrinal and disciplinary aspects of the Puritan movement at the time. From what happened to the Articles after they were approved, we know that the government began to look on Puritan doctrine when it was High Calvinist as also suspect. The reappearance of the subject at the Hampton Court Conference shows also that the Puritans felt that doctrine was also a part of their platform for getting the changes they wanted in the Church.

---

[1] "Archbishop Whitgift and the Lambeth Articles", Church Quarterly Review, CXVII (1933), 25-52. She says (page 52) that the Articles were "a successful attempt to neutralize that which was fast becoming a very real menace to the purity of doctrine professed by the Anglican Church." The fact is that they did not at all succeed in neutralizing Calvinism; as I have noted, they became the largest element in inhibiting the development of Anglican doctrine toward a more liberal position.

The whole issue of the precipitation of the Lambeth Articles and their purposes and results is tied up with the figure of Peter Baro and the opinions which he, as it seems, originated in his teaching at Cambridge and by which he incurred the wrath of the great Whitaker. It is necessary, then, to begin with a summary of what we know and have been able to find out about this man and what he taught. I am of the opinion that Peter Baro would probably never have become the *cause célèbre* that he became, had he not, in a vulnerable position, given voice to doctrines which the purists in the Church detected and resented in those whose positions were too high to be reached. It is not too much to say that he represented a party in the Church (larger than most authities have been willing to recognize) which had come to resent the drive toward scholastic Calvinism that was forming as part of the Puritan position. Puritanism when it engaged the sentiments of the young Lancelot Andrewes[1] had been a humanistic Puritanism, which could use even the stage for its ends. But, starting in the Universities at this time, there was a development which was to alienate much of the humanistic impulse of the time, sooner or later. Peter Baro is a typical voice of this Christian humanism which was to find that it could no longer live with Calvinism as it was developed by the successors of Calvin. The party of which he formed a part was to be led by Lancelot Andrewes, who became their most respected voice, although he always took care to keep from acting like the spokesman of a party. Overall was another member, their theological leader. In fact, their efforts, until the days of Laud, were to be directed toward keeping from becoming a party. They did all they could, usually, to keep from entering upon abstract theological discussion, and tried to concentrate upon questions of worship and ritual. Their central interest at this time and even through the time of Laud was to regain for the Church its influence and functional place in society. Whitgift, in Walton's Life of Hooker, reminds the Queen that "Religion is the Foundation and Cement of humane Societies". He and his successors saw that

---

[1] See M. M. Knappen, "The Early Puritanism of Lancelot Andrewes", Church History, II (1933), 95-104. Professor Knappen connects Andrewes to Laurence Chaderton, who is to appear prominently among the opponents of Baro.

> ...the restoration of the influence of the Church depended upon the restoration of its economic preponderance and...came to demand not simply a reversion to the doctrines of Henry VIII, but a restoration of the wealth of which Henry and his successors had deprived the Church. 1

"From all these causes," says Mr. Trevor-Roper, describing the origins of the Arminians, "and for all these purposes, a group of men came together in the slack days of James I to advocate positive doctrines." But these doctrines had been positive before, and their beginnings are long before the time of James. The point which Mr. Trevor-Roper marks is that at which they become conscious of the necessity of acting as a party, and what makes them aware of that necessity is the example of what happened to the party of liberal doctrines in Holland.

---

1 Trevor-Roper, Laud, p. 28. The stress and closeness of the issue which produced the party may be seen in the words of Whitgift's memorandum recommending Bancroft to the See of London: (Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church, Appendix, II, 366-369.) "Whilst he hath been occupied for 15 or 16: yeares as hath been expressed [in opposing the innovators and Puritan attacks on the Church, Martin Marprelate etc.] 17 or 18 of his Juniors (few or none of them being of his experience) have been preferred, eleven to Deaneries, and the rest to Bishopricks of which number, some have formerly been inclined to Faction, and the most as neuters have expected the issue, that so they might as things should fall out run with the time. They that list may enter into ye consideration hereof particularly."

Those doctrines became positive in the writings and teaching of Peter Baro, but those doctrines, as it seems to me, are the rationalization of the more prominent manifestation of this movement at the time, which has been summarized by Professor Usher as The Reconstruction of the English Church. The author insists that this reconstruction was entirely administrative and legal, but I think such a view is open to grave criticism. The era of administrative evolution for its own sake, of administration for efficiency only, is of a later date than the seventeenth century, and even to-day most historians would term it an historic fiction. Bancroft, the hero of Professor Usher's recital, was restoring something which was not merely a legal fabric, but which in the necessities of the time had also to be a doctrinal fabric. Discipline is merely the 'execution and applying of doctrine home' for Bancroft, too, however much the legal and institutional may take the foreground.

There is now no doubt, I think, that Whitgift, who was Bancroft's patron, was also one of the party although it is probably true that his theology was never as liberal as Overall's and Andrewes'. But he too had come to see that the defence of the Church required not only the reinstatement of the Canon Law and the power of Convocation, but also a doctrinal opposition to the dogmatic advance of High Calvinism. His assent to the Lambeth Articles represented his attempt to keep the powerful academic minority, represented by Whitaker, from going over to opposition to the Church as it was, and at the same time to curb the advancing rigidity that they wished to impose upon the doctrines of the Church. His position must have appeared to him much as it appeared to Sir Philip Warwick looking back on the issues after the Restoration. Warwick says:

> ...if both sides had observed the wisdom of the church's reformation in the latitude of her articles, neither side by their sly adversaries had been overthrown. Thus still it is, Perditio tua ex te, O Israel! ... And hence it may appear that both sides were faulty, it being much more necessary for us men to know what God positively hath determined in relation to our duty, than what in point of decree he hath preordained in order unto our salvation. Although it is true too, that God's eternal decrees of man's last end were not without a just respect unto his actions, as our salvation itself depends upon the performance of our duty thereto required....whilst the church puritan (of which there were very many knowing, learned, and probably good men,) opposed the more canonical church men, the knave puritan overthrew both: for the less ceremonial sort of churchmen,...all protested the reformation projected by our long lay-parliament men and assembly of divines.... [1]

Whitgift's attitude as the situation develops shows, as I shall demonstrate, how reluctant he was to admit that this doctrinal issue should be related to the disciplinary one. He is at first fierce toward Baro for 'disturbing the peace of the Church', but in the end he realizes he must support him. The junction of the two issues can be seen in the words of Baro (as retailed by Strype) in his letter to Andrewes on January 20, 1596. Andrewes is staying at Lambeth, perhaps having gone there on purpose to appeal for Baro. Baro mentions that Overall and Dr. Clayton had spoken for him in the trial he had just been subjected to by the Vice-Chancellor and Heads. Strype says:

---

[1] Sir Philip Warwick, Memoires of the Reign of King Charles I, Edinburgh, 1813, p. 92.

> He further spake in his said letter of Mr. Perkins; who, he said, the Lord's day before, in his sermon, endeavored to confute the reasons of Mr. Overal, which he had taught at his living, that Christ died for all [in some church, I suppose, in Cambridge]. And that Overal desired it might be signified to him [Andrewes]. For that he had obtained, as Baro said, if he mistook not, from the Bishops of Canterbury and London, that those who contradicted him in his living, preaching pro Christo [in vindication of Christ's merits,] should be repressed. Adding, that if such letters might be obtained to restrain this man, peace would be better provided for.
>
> We, added our Professor, [in the name of himself and others, in the colleges, of his judgment,] desire all these things may be made known to my Lord of Canterbury: that he may understand this evil doth not only now creep into this kingdom and Church, but lifteth up its head, as is publicly promulgated and defended, to the great reproach of our religion. And hence it will come to pass, as we hope, that then he will be more favorable to us, when in a pious zeal and grief for this evil, we shall say something more ardently for defending of the truth. For it doth not seem to be a time, said he, of holding one's peace, if we desire to give a good account to God.
>
> And that, he adds, if at least, he [Dr. Andrewes] could prevail, that Perkins, who declaimed against Overal, might be restrained, he should do an acceptable thing to both, and should confer a singular benefit upon him himself. For that the matter was common to them both, [Overall and Baro]... 1

This appeal was successful, but Baro, being more vulnerable than Overall and Andrewes, did not stand for re-election to

---

1 II, 305. . In 1592/3 Overall had been reported to Aylmer, Bishop of London, for preaching universal grace at his first charge in Epping (Miss Overall's thesis, cited above, p. 225.) and as a result had lost his place. He had apparently gained the promise of Fletcher that the same should not happen again. See my note, page 222 below.

(I use the condensations of various letters and documents in Strype merely for convenience. I have checked most of them against microfilms of the MSS. he used.)

his Professorship. He had to be sacrificed to the purposes of peace with the other party. In 1600, however, Overall was successfully upheld in a similar issue to Baro's, at Cambridge. The important fact here is that this deliberate identification of himself by Baro with the party of Andrewes was enough to extricate him from his difficulties, at least temporarily.

It is likely that Baro had been identified with the party even earlier than this, however, at least in his own mind. His letter of thanks to Whitgift, after the quarrel had died down, mentions in passing some preliminary skirmishes. In Strype's summary, Baro thanks the Archbishop for his intervention:

> For he observed, that since the return of the Vice-Chancellor, [who it seems had been with the Archbishop, and received his instructions,] neither he nor anyone else had spoken to him of past matters: which he doubted not was done out of a reverence towards him [Whitgift]. For otherwise, as he concluded, those who laboured this against him had very hardly desisted, being those very persons who, if he mistook not, ten or eleven years ago, in a certain clandestine synod at London (the acts whereof were with his Grace,) decreed certain things against him unheard. Concerning which, when he had been certified by one Fontanus, he presently took a journey to London, and complained to Dr. Goad, who had been present at it in King's College house situate near the Thames; praying him that he would at least show him what they had decreed concerning him or against him. Which, he said, he could not obtain of him; nor knew, before Dr. Bancroft, by his [the Archbishop's] command shewed him in a certain book three or four years ago.
>
> And that it was from that time, as he continued his discourse to the Archbishop, that they hating him, and privily always observing him, took at last the occasion, from that sermon of his, to labour to cast him out of the University with shame. And which, he said, they had easily performed, (they had so prepared all things against him,) unless they

> had been stayed by his Grace's authority, and as with a bridle restrained. 1

The last facts we know about Baro are that his funeral in 1600 was accompanied by a highly unusual procession of all the ministers of London. As Strype puts it, he

> ...was carried decently, six doctors of divinity his pall-bearers, from his house in the parish, to the church of St. Olave, Hartstreet; attended by the ministers of the city, according to an order from the bishop of London. 2

There can be no doubt that Bancroft did this to show that

---

1 Page 311. Strype notes that the synod was "held probably by Cartwright and his followers", seemingly a mere guess. The date, however, makes it highly probable, for it was just at this time, about 1585, that Elizabeth had been deluged with the first Puritan petitions, and Bancroft (in Usher's words, I, 42) "...had come forward with proof that these pious petitions and phrases were neither the result of discontent with the Bishops, nor the product of a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction among the laity, but had their roots in a scheme of some hundred-odd ministers to change the government of the Church from Episcopacy to Presbyterianism." It is evident, then, both that the Puritan moves were both doctrinal and disciplinary, and that Baro's ability to demonstrate that fact brought Whitgift in on his side. It was this activity by Bancroft and the seemingly very efficient intelligence service he had set up which made Whitgift recommend Bancroft for the See of London. He writes in the recommendation I cited above: "By his diligence to find out certain Letters and writings, Mr. Cartwright and his accomplices, their setting up their discipline secretly in most shires of the Realm, their Classes, their Decrees, and Book of Discipline were first detected."

2 Annals of the Reformation...., 1829, four volumes, IV, 322. Wood says in Fasti Oxonienses, II, 203: "After this author Peter Baro had been removed from Cambridge, he went to London, lived and died in Crutched Fryers, and was buried in the Church of St Olave in Hart Street. At whose internment the bishop of London ordered the most eminent divines and ministers in that city to be present." Baro's grandson says (Baker MSS. xxix, Univ. Libr. Cambr. Mm 1. 40.) "...at whose buriall, the Bp. of London commanded the company of all the ministers in the citty."

the doctrines of Peter Baro had the approbation of the Church party. Conversely, it appears that this is the time when the Church first comes forward to acknowledge that it has gone as far in the development of High Calvinism as it is going to go, and that the process must stop.[1] The Archbishop is reluctant to recognize that this time has come, but the younger men like Bancroft, Andrewes and Overall recognize it. I shall show that it is significant that the man with whom Baro first comes into contact is Laurence Chaderton, who was prominently identified with the first wave of Puritan petitions and conventicles.[2]

We may assume then that the doctrinal issue that I am about to survey takes its place in the whole history of the English Puritan movement as a shift in front for strategic purposes, from discipline to doctrine.

---

[1] Mullinger in The University of Cambridge, (II, 322) says: "In conjunction with the Archbishop, he [Bancroft] appears about this time to have given the signal for the revolt of English Protestantism from the authority of Beza." His analysis of the issues of the time is also in agreement with my conclusion. He says (II, 325): "Hitherto, as we have before noted, the Puritan agitation had been directed almost exclusively against the English discipline; and Parker and Dering, Whitgift and Cartwright, Aylmer and Travers, strong as were their feelings of personal antagonism, were still with respect to doctrine in essential agreement. But the period of Whitaker's mastership of St John's may be looked upon as that when more fundamental divisions began to appear - a change of which Everard Digby's invectives against Calvinistic tenets was one of the earliest indications."

[2] Usher says (I, 42) of Bancroft's knowledge of the Puritan movement at its beginnings: "It is just possible that Chaderton, Bancroft's bosom friend fifteen years earlier, had approached him in the interests of the new party, perhaps to secure his adherence, ...or had in some unguarded moment let slip a phrase which gave a clue to the secret."

What swings the balance in the end is the strength of the Court. The largest element is Elizabeth's obstinate refusal to have the doctrines of the Articles any more fully or narrowly defined in any way. "She avoided clear-cut theological definitions which might alienate potential political support."[1] But it is also evident that the whole doctrine of predestination as the High Calvinists wanted it defined frightened Burghley on other grounds than political policy. All through the battle, Whitaker seemed confident of the support of Burghley, but when he and Tyndal sent a copy of the Articles to Burghley soon after the conference, and then went to see him, Burghley said, as Strype reports, that

> ...he had read some part of what he had presented him with. That as for his sermon ad clerum (which he had also presented him with) it contained mysteries too high for his understanding. And concerning the proposition of Predestination, he seemed to mislike of it. And reasoned some while with Whitaker about these heads: and drew, by a similitude, a reason from an earthly prince. Inferring thereby, that they charged God with cruelty, and might cause men to be desperate in their wickedness. To which that learned man thought fit to say but little; considering that Lord's present weakness by reason of want of health; but only that nothing was in that behalf set down, but what was in the article set out by public authority; and so seeing these matters were too deep for him (as he said), he bade him and the other Doctor farewell; and gave them thanks for making him acquainted with these things. 2

Elizabeth's grounds for rebuking Whitgift for the Articles are, as I shall demonstrate, much the same as those Baro uses against them from the beginning. She manages to complicate the issue of course by turning her wrath against Baro for

---

1 M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 168.
2 Strype's Whitgift, II, 287.

disturbing the Church, but her wrath is also against the Articles. Proof of the Court's attitude is found in the fact that it makes sure that it is Overall who succeeds Whitaker as Regius Professor, not the High Calvinist Wotton who is also a candidate.

Peter Baro[1] was not one of the earliest, nor one of the most famous, of those foreigners who came to England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and enriched its life and thought.[2] There had been many more famous before him and there were to be a few after him, as England under James withdrew more and more into herself. Baro's process of arriving at a modification of High Calvinist theology is strikingly parallel to that of Arminius, although there is no record at all of their ever having known each other, and, in fact, Baro had been preaching and teaching for twenty years before Arminius made his voice heard. The voice of Arminius was certainly not heard outside Holland until the turn of the century, although the first charges against him were made within his church in 1587. They both studied at Geneva under Calvin and Beza, were ordained by Calvin himself, and developed their positions on grounds that are essentially humanist. They both reacted violently against the scholastic extension of Calvinism which was going on apace in the late sixteenth century. The striking fact about Baro's own doctrines is actually that, although he was supported and agreed with by those for whom the prime motive was the support of the Episcopal discipline, he himself puts little emphasis on the Church. His approach is philosophic and rational. Had the development of English Arminianism been left with Baro it might perhaps have become much what Dutch Arminianism became. But in Andrewes and Bancroft and Laud this theological development was made the rationale of a concept of church organization, and, until the Latitudinarians, was always subordinate to it. In Holland the theology dictated the Church discipline; in England the church discipline dictated the theology.

---

[1] Baro seems to be the occasion of more errors from passing reference than any figure of the time. Professor Knappen's comment (p.369) in *Tudor Puritanism* implies that he was a disciple of Arminius, or influenced by Dutch Arminianism: He says: "When, in 1595, the Huguenot professor Peter Baro ventured to introduce the liberal doctrines of the Dutch Arminians into his Cambridge divinity lectures, Whitgift supported the University authorities in their efforts to suppress such teaching." This is in error in almost every detail. Baro had been writing and teaching the same doctrines (as the formal complaints against him testify) for over twenty years before 1595; they are not the doctrines of Arminius, and neither he nor anyone else involved in the dispute refers to Arminius or the Netherlands in any way as the source of his doctrines; (Whitaker, in fact, as I shall show, goes up to London for the making of the Articles to oppose 'the Lutherans'); and to assume that Whitgift supported the University authorities is far too sweeping. Professor Tawney's mistake is simply amusing. He cites Baro among the Puritan opponents of usury as one "whose Puritanism lost him his professorship." (*Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, Pelican Books, p. 179.)

[2] Note the introduction to James' patent conferring a pension on Casaubon, in 1611.:

As our progenitors have heretofore been carefull to call into their realme persons of eminent learning, agreeing in profession of religion with the church of England, and here to make use of them for the furtherance of learning and religion among their people; as namelie of Paulus Fagius, Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, and others; soe have wee, in regard of the singular learning of Isaac Casaubon, and of his concurrancye with us and the church of England in profession of religion, invited him out of Fraunce into this our realme, here to make his aboad; and to be used by us as we shall see cause for the service of the church;..." (Pattison's *Isaac Casaubon*, p. 282-3.)

Cambridge underwent a large expansion and flowering in the sixteenth century. The first reformers in England had found their home in Oxford and their energies had come from a Reformation attack on scholasticism. Colet's lectures on his return from Italy in 1496 had been on the Pauline Epistles, which he saw not dogmatically but historically. Of his purpose Cassirer says:

> er will aus ihnen nicht ein System der Theologie gewinnen, sondern er will sich die reine Urform des Christlichen Glaubens, wie sie vor aller Theologies und unabhängig von allen scholastischen Reflexionen und Deutingen bestand, innerlig gegenwartig und lebendig machen. [1]

This is as good a description as can be found of the basic historical impulse of the Anglican party. One hundred years later this new theology had to fight another kind of scholasticism: the Calvinistic scholasticism, which used the accusations of 'bringing the Popish Schoolmen into credit' to cover their own maze of quiddities about the decrees of God. One of the objects of their attack was also too great a use of the classics and pagan writers. As Lancelot Andrewes was once accused of having gained his bishopric by his knowledge of Plautus and Terence, so in the attack on Baro's *De Fide* written by one E. H. in 1592, entitled *De Fide, Eiusque Ortu et Natura, Contra P. Baronis...*, the author ridicules Baro especially for "...divinumque tuum Platonem, & sophistam Stageriten, aut horum similes tenebrarum, & insanientis sapientiae conditores...." [2] And yet in all of

---

[1] See Ernst Cassirer, *Die Platonische Renaissance in England und Die Schule von Cambridge*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, Leipzig, 1932, p. 74.

[2] Page 66.Professor Battenhouse notes that the outbreak of

Baro's works the quotations from the classics are certainly not over-abundant; it is true however, that the classical, humanist basis for his attack on the determinism implied in predestination is apparent. Mullinger quotes the advice of John Knox,: 'above all things' to 'preserve the Kirk from the bondage of the universities'.[1] In so far as they were the sources of humanism and the birthplace of critical scholarship he had a shrewd eye for the dangers to his development of religion.

Cambridge had remained strongly Catholic until the return of Cartwright and his election as Lady Margaret Professor in 1569.[2] Oxford too had been almost completely Romanist at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, but under Leicester as Chancellor and with Humphry and Rainolds teaching there it, too, went to the opposite extreme. It is probable that even Hooker as an undergraduate was of the 'Puritan' party, since he and Rainolds, who was his tutor, were suspended for a time in one of the disputes over an election in which the

---

Baro's first controversy with Chaderton in 1581 coincided with Marlowe's entrance to the University. The new view of Marlowe's religious principles, and the reinterpretation of Doctor Faustus may well be fortified by the knowledge that the beginnings of Arminianism arise in the same revolt as Marlowe voices against the overweening reason and its too deep searching into the purposes of God. The advance of Puritan rationalism took all knowledge to be its province, knowledge which the traditional theology held was beyond man. The Queen and the Court object to the Lambeth Articles because they deal with "a matter tender and dangerous to weak ignorant minds." (Strype Whitgift, II, 286, Burghley's letter to Whitgift.)

[1] The University of Cambridge, II, 365.

[2] The Lady Margaret Professorship was established at Cambridge in 1502 by the mother of Henry VII. Baro succeeded to it in 1574.

theological issues of the day were embodied. But Oxford was not nearly so alive at this period as Cambridge. With Cartwright began the ascendancy of the Genevan reformers at Cambridge and there was almost constant dissension from then on until the end of the century. This was not mitigated by Cartwright's expulsion, which was accomplished by Whitgift himself in 1570. With William Whitaker the High Calvinists achieved a respectability they had not known before. He became Regius Professor of Divinity in 1580, and soon was admired by the whole world of scholarship for his writings against Bellarmine and Stapleton. The fruits of his scholarship in Perkins and Ames also dominated the theology of European Calvinism for the next generation. It may well have been a large part of Whitgift's purpose in fostering Hooker's Ecclesiasticall Polity to have someone not so closely connected with Puritanism attain some recognition in the world of scholarship. As Master of St John's college Whitaker was terrible against schismatics both in doctrine and discipline, although, as we shall see, his greatest anger was reserved for those who could not go all the way with him into High Calvinism. Authorities seem to differ on his sympathies with the Puritan discipline. His appointment as Master of St John's was opposed in 1586 by a majority of the fellows because of his supposed leanings toward Puritanism,[1] and Mullinger notes that he was supposed to have participated in secret meetings with Cartwright and Dod at the time of the first Puritan outbreaks in 1585.[1] It may be that he was frightened back into the fold when the movement for reform went off into such excesses as the Marprelate writings, and when Cartwright and the other leaders were harried by the Establishment. At any rate he seems to have Whitgift's entire respect and confidence in the dealings about the Lambeth Articles. There are records of many proceedings against Puritans and Puritanism at Cambridge in the early part of the century, but they are uniformly, up to 1580, on questions of conformity in vestments and ceremonies. Whitaker was again unsuccessful in his candidacy for election as Master of Trinity in 1593, but there is no record of the reasons for it. His attempt to expel Everard Digby from St John's in 1588 for his intemperate explosions against Calvinistic predestination, although sometimes represented as part of the campaign against Arminianism, cannot really be included in the history of this movement: Digby's principles are Roman Catholic, not at all Protestant, and there is no evidence to connect him with Baro's party. It is clear from the charges preferred against him, and from Digby's own admissions, that his is an openly Papist position: "He inveighed in open disputations against Calvinists, as against schismatikes." And furthermore, as the eighth in the schedule of charges against him reads:

---

[1] Dictionary of National Biography.

> In the time of a sermon and communion, he went about fishing openly in the backside with a

---

[1] II, 322.

> casting nett, with some schollers in his companie, even then when charge was geven by authoritie from above, that whosoever did not communicate, his name shold be sent up. 1

Worse than that, he did not pay his commons!

The first Arminians were staunch Protestants, whatever they were charged with being. The charge of schismatic is never raised against them; much less do they raise it against the Calvinists.

Against the movement toward a more and more rigid dogma and High Calvinism, only Peter Baro, it seems, stands out in the beginning. That, at least, is the way it seems from the standpoint of the accounts which assume that High Calvinism was the prevailing doctrine from the beginning. But the fact is that there takes place a large development in Calvinist doctrine in the writings of Perkins and Whitaker, between the 1580's and 1595 when the climax comes. High Calvinism is in a process of development, and it takes twenty years for it to gain sufficient confidence in its strength to move against the liberals. Even then the High Calvinists choose a more vulnerable target than the Lady Margaret Professor; they proceed first against young Barrett. From the later charges against Baro, however, it is clear that he has been the object of the attack from the beginning.

Peter Baro, as we know from a manuscript outline of the

---

1 James Heywood and Thomas Wright, Cambridge University Transactions during the Puritan Controversies of the 16th and 17th Centuries, two volumes, London, 1854, I, 519.

facts of his life evidently copied from one in his own hand,[1] was born at Étampes, France in December 1534. He studied law at Bourges, one of the centres of religious reform in France, and was made Bachelor of Civil Law on April 9, 1556. "Le jour suivant", he says, "receu licentier es loix estant aage de 22: a 23: ans." The next year he proceeded to Paris and "...fut receu et jure Advocat en la Court de Parlement de Paris." However, like Jean Calvin before him, he proceeded from the law to theology. What impelled him to the change he does not say. The law will be reflected in his writings later on. His *Praelectiones* on Jonah deal fully with the Old Law and the New Law in theology; and his *De praestantia et dignitate divinae legis* of 1586 is a full treatise on the law in theology. Even there, however, the law is made for man and not man for the law.

In December 1560 he proceeded to Geneva, where Arminius was to go in 1581, like him probably, attracted by the reputation of Calvin. There, as he says, "s'étant adonné à l'estude de théologie, fut fait ministre et receut l'imposition des mains par Jean Calvin." The academy at Geneva where

---

[1] University Library Cambridge Mm 1 40; Baker MSS. xxix, ff. 184-8. It consists of a series of transcriptions from the University records of dates of payment of his stipend of twenty pounds a year. For 1597 Baro receives only pay for "the quarter ended at Michaelmas, lib. 5"; the rest is recorded as paid to Dr. Playfere. Anthony à Wood (*Fasti Oxon*. II, 203) says this is "under his own hand", but it looks to be a much later one than the MSS. contemporary with Baro; if any of those are in his hand, this one certainly is not. Wood probably read hastily the words of the copyist which are: "Thus far seems to be in Dr. Peter Baron's own hand". This refers, however, to our Baro's son, who was a fellow at Cambridge at the same time. The father Peter Baro was "incorporated" at Oxford on July 11, 1576, being already D. D. of Cambridge.

Casaubon later studied (beginning in 1578) and taught, had been founded only in 1559. It was meant for a theological seminary and little else. Pattison describes it thus in his biography of Casaubon:

> The academy [the upper school] consisted at first of three chairs, Hebrew, Greek, and Arts. The department of Theology, which was the capital consideration, was taught by Calvin (afterwards by Beza) as pastor without the title of professor. After a time, chairs in Law and Medicine were added. 1

Baro evidently knew enough of both Greek and Hebrew to be ahead of general English accomplishment in these disciplines when he came to England. His first position, in fact, was teaching Hebrew. It may well be, however, that he knew Hebrew as well as the Law before he went to Geneva. It may even be that he taught law there, since he had just graduated in it, but if this were so it is likely that he would have mentioned it.

Baro's grandson's recital of the facts of his life farther along in the manuscript says, (in answer to the question: "Where was he made a minister or Priest, & by whome was he ordained?") "He was made a minister in Geneva by Mr. Beza". Both Baro's own statement, and his grandson's may be true, of course. Or, Baro himself, having broken so strongly with the doctrines of Beza, may not have wished to reveal this connection. Beza came to Geneva in 1558.

Baro apparently returned to France and was married some time before 1564, for his first three children are recorded

---

1 Page 12. Pattison gives a picture of the school life, p. 14 ff.

as having been born at Orleans. His wife was the daughter of a merchant, and he was married at Gien, which is a few miles northwest of Bourges. From Orleans he evidently removed to Sancerre, for in 1568, he records, his next child was born there. This town is also northwest of Bourges. What his occupation was in these towns, he does not say, but we may assume that he was minister of the Protestant churches.

Baro's flight from France was evidently in consequence of the disorders which culminated in the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of 1572. How he made his contacts in England is not known. He may well have met Englishmen at Geneva as students, or even some of the Marian exiles.[1] Burghley was evidently instrumental in bringing him to England, for on his arrival

> that compassionate nobleman entertained [him] with much humanity in his family;
>
> and he eat at his table. Afterwards, by his recommendation, (who was Chancellor,) he removed to Cambridge, and was made the Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity there about the year 1574. 2

Baro, versed in Hebrew, Greek, and the law, as well as divinity, must have seemed a valuable acquisition for building up the academic riches of Cambridge. As Fuller said of him "...the Professor's place as much needed him as he it."

---

[1] Pattison (p. 22) quotes those protesting against the closing of the Academy in Geneva in 1585 as saying: "The reputation of our school is so widely spread that even England sends us students." The last of the exiles were probably leaving as Baro arrived in 1560.

[2] Strype's Whitgift, I, 188. The details about his entertainment at Burghley's table comes from Baro's letter to Burghley in December 1580, appealing for more financial assistance. (printed in Strype's Whitgift, III, 63.) Strype says that there was a letter extant also written to Burghley by Baro in 1584 thanking him for interposing with Dr. Perne to have Baro's son admitted to the "year of probation." (I, 189.) This was Peter who became a doctor of medicine and was naturalized by statute. (Athenae Cantab.)

Baro himself says:

> Depuis la sudict Pierre Baron s'estant retiré avecq sa femme Guillemette Bourgoin et ses enfants à Cambridge l'une des deux universités d'Angleterre, à cause des troubles de la France, fut la Professeur es lettres Hebraiques, et en théologie....

In one of his Praelectiones on Jonah, Baro uses France as an example of the evils of civil strife, and there and in other places, notably in the dedication of his De Praestantia et dignitate divinae Legis, he speaks feelingly of the privilege England enjoys of peace in matters of religion.[1]

Apparently Baro spent some time in Cambridge before being elected to his Professorship. In 1576 Stephen Goad, who was later to be the leader, as Vice-Chancellor of the University, in the actions against Baro, had to answer some complaints by a group of the fellows of King's College of which he was provost. One of the charges was[2] that he had hindered learning. In answer Goad pointed out that

> he had caused an ordinary Greek lecture to be read; and a Hebrew lecture, for students in divinity, to be read in the chapel; and lately in his own lodging, privately, by one Baro, a Frenchman. For the furtherance of the study of divinity, he had pro-

---

[1] "Praelectio VI" (p.35). He pictures France "...quod ante quidem florentissimum fuit, sed jam ita deficit ab antiquis Legibus & pietate, ut ejus malitia ad Caelum usque, pervenisse videatur." In such a case, he says, the people recognize the truth better than the governors, and there vox populi, vox Dei.

[2] Another was that he had allowed his wife to come "within the quadrant of the college."

> cured a divinity lecture to be read publicly in the common hall by the said Mr Baro: who had a stipend of twenty marks early gathered, without any charge to the college, being supplied by contribution from him [Goad] and the company. 1

Strype says also that later "He was entertained in Peterhouse; and Dr. Perne, the Master, favoured him".[2] He was later settled in Trinity College "by the endeavours of Dr. Perne"[3] and finally elected, as Baro says in his letter to Burghley in 1580, "...his auctoritate ac suffragiis primariorum hujus academiae virorum, mihique amicissimorum...." Whitgift seems to have had a part in making his election possible, for in his dedication of his De praestantia to the Archbishop in 1586, Baro says:

> Me namq.; hominem peregrinum quum hic duodecimum abhinc annum procancellarii munus obires theologia in hac schola professorem, tua, & voce, ex electorum suffragiis creasti et manu, libelli videlicet traditione in eiusdem muneris possessionem misisti, quo adhuc functus sum, & Dei gratia fungor.

Whitgift was master of Trinity at the time. Baro succeeded Dr. John Still, the guardian and tutor of John Overall, as

---

[1] Strype, Annals, II, ii, 38-39.

[2] Whitgift, I, 188. His patronage by Andrew Perne (c. 1519-1586) might be enough to make any Puritan suspect him. Perne had managed to keep his position by conforming to the Marian change back to Catholicism, even though he was one of those who argued against transubstantiation in the Convocation after Mary's accession, and was rebuked for it by Weston. He preached the sermon at the condemnation of the dead bodies of Bucer and Fagius, but after Elizabeth's accession he also helped pass the grace which restored them to their honors. He had a part in protecting Whitgift and others from persecution under Mary. His study and library were chosen to be shown to Paul de Foix the French Ambassador in 1571 as the worthiest in all England. He was satirized by Gabriel Harvey, and perhaps by Spenser, but defended by Nashe. (C. H. Cooper, and T. Cooper, Athenae Cantabrigienses, two volumes, Cambridge, 1861, II, 45-49.)

[3] Fasti Oxon.

Lady Margaret Professor; Still was made Master of St. John's, succeeded Whitgift as Master of Trinity in 1577, and in 1592 became Bishop of Bath and Wells. Overall only matriculated as a sizar at St. John's in 1575, but it may well be that he studied under Baro. It is almost certain that he heard him lecture. Overall followed Still to Trinity when Still succeeded Whitgift as Master, was made fellow of the College in 1581 and remained one for fifteen years, so they were associates for most of the time Baro was at Cambridge.[1] In 1576 Baro was incorporated L.L.B. of Peterhouse and shortly thereafter made D.D. of Cambridge.

There are no disturbances of record for six years after Baro took over his professorship. It is evident, however, that he had gained a considerable following by 1579, for in that year his first work was published, the initiative coming, not from himself, apparently, but from one Osmund Lake. It was his in Joham Prophetam Praelectiones 39, "Opera et studio

---

[1] The Baker manuscript which I have cited has a copy of a letter to one Mr. Leigh written by Baro's grandson from Lynn on April 3, 1671, evidently in answer to some inquiries. The grandson says he has had to write to friends in Lincolnshire to get the information requested of him, which has evidently had to do with the claim made by Lestrange that Baro had retired to France after he left his professorship. The grandson says that the information probably came from a sermon by Dr. Ward, master of Sidney College, "and," says the grandson, "also Lady Margaret Professor in my time," in which he had "used som unhandsom words" about Peter Baro. The grandson relates that he went to Ward after the publication of the sermon and pointed out the error. Ward, he says, was "much troubled" and called in his sermon. It must have been somewhat disconcerting for Ward to have the namesake of the man who by that time had become the straw-man for any High Calvinist argument, to appear before him to refute his facts. I have not been able to find any sermon which answers this description, however.

Osmundi Laki Cantabrigiensis, e Regio Collegio Ministri, collecta & ab Authore ipso recognita." There is little to be discovered about Osmund Lake. The next year Baro addressed the prefatory letter of his De Fide: "Ornatissimo Viro ac vigilanti & sedulo Ecclesiae Ringuodensis Pastori, Osmundo Lako, sacrae Theologie Baccalaureo.", and John Bingham, who was at Cambridge during the time of the Lambeth Articles, remembers Lake as "...Regalis Collegii socius, Baroni amore et benevolentia coniunctissimus..."[1] Watts in Bibliotheca Britannica records that there are verses by Lake prefixed to a Dr. Bingham's edition of three of Demosthenes' orations translated into Latin by Dr. Nicholas Carr, published in London in 1571, that he was at one time proctor of the University, later vicar of Ringwood, and that he wrote A Probe Theologicall published in 1612.[2] He died in 1621, but there are no more traces of him in the rise of Arminianism.

That there was some opposition to Baro's line of teaching, however, is apparent from the fact that Lake feels it necessary to insert another opinion of a Continental theologian into the Praelectiones after Baro's exposition of his views on Christ's descent into Hell; and the De Fide of the year found Baro defending some of his views as he had put them forward in the Praelectiones. I shall discuss these more in detail later.

---

[1] Philip C. Molhuysen, Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius, Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatien LXIV, two volumes, 'S-Gravenhage, 1928, I, 413.

[2] STC No. 15136.

It is evident, nonetheless, that Baro had at least a large group of friends, from the prefatory verses which they hastened to write for his Praelectiones. One of them was Giles Fletcher, the father of Giles and Phineas, brother of the Bishop of London. He is recorded in Athenae Cantabrigienses as having the lease of Ringwood, so he is presumably responsible for Osmund Lake's preferment there. Whether they all were of his party doctrinally is another question. Laurence Chaderton, who wrote one of the most complimentary, was to be Baro's bitterest opponent a year later. The verses are headed: "Epigrammata quaedam a doctissimis quibusdam viris, Amoris ergo ac benevolentiae in Authorem, composita." Two of them are in Hebrew; three in Greek.

Giles Fletcher (or Aegidius, as he signs himself) had been one of the complainants about Goad's administration of King's, when he had had to sign a retractation, so he had probably sat under Baro's first teaching. He was later one of the first travellers to Russia and, after being diverted to the study of civil law by injunction of the provost, became, in 1589, Master of Requests in Ordinary at Court. Another prefatory poet was one Robert Wright, who became the principal tutor of the Earl of Essex, and head of the Earl's household.[1] Another was Nicholas Bound, whose Sabbatarian book, published in 1595, was a landmark in the Anglican-Puritan controversy. But like Chaderton, he was at this time a friend of Baro's. The others had nothing particularly to distinguish them. They were Abraham Conham, and James Scruby, all fellows of various colleges.

---

[1] Overall was to pay a visit to Essex in prison at the time of his disgrace. According to Miss Overall, the subject of their interview was to settle the Earl's mind about lawful recreations on the Sabbath.

It seems evident that there was a period of delightful and friendly unanimity of scholarship and theology at Cambridge in the 1570's, rudely disturbed by the attack on Baro in 1580 or 1581. Calvinistic scholasticism and early Puritanism seem to be responsible for this muddying of the waters.

We must include among Baro's following at this time, or a little later, one John Ludham, who in 1590 was to publish a translation of the theses, which Baro had defended in the 'Schools', appended to the Praelectiones, under the titles: "God's Purpose and Decree taketh not away the Liberty of Man's Corrupt Will;" and "Our Conjunction with Christ is altogether spiritual." He also "englished" Baro's A speciall Treatise of God's Providence, which was licensed in 1588. There are two editions extant; one undated, and one dated 1590. On the title-page of the latter, Ludham is described as Vicar of Wethersfield, a position he had held since 1570. Professor Knappen names him as the non-resident superior of Richard Rogers, an Elizabethan Puritan whose diary Professor Knappen has edited. He says:

> The incumbent of the living at Wethersfield during most of Rogers' stay there was a John Ludham, who was appointed vicar in 1570 and died in 1613. However, since his name never seems to occur in the diary it is likely that he was non-resident, and that Rogers performed the work of a curate. 1

---

1 M.M. Knappen, Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, p. 20.

Here perhaps is one of the reasons for the Puritan triumph. While Rogers was ministering to Ludham's parish, no doubt with the 'very comfortable' doctrine of Absolute Predestination, it did not make a very great deal of difference to the people of his parish that John Ludham was at Cambridge helping to break down the intellectual acceptance of that same doctrine. It did not, that is, make much difference in historical events for the next fifty years. It did, however, have its part in forming the oppositions that lie behind those events.[1]

Many of the writers of these thirteen prefatory verses mention the fact that Baro is versed in law. One of the underlying differences between the Puritan and the Anglican that come to the issue just now and in the next two decades is the different concept of law. It was the rigid Puritan concept of law which was becoming almost the same as the Hebrew Law was for the Pharisees, a single absolute code contained in Scripture, allowing for no human scale of law whatever that could not be found in Scripture, that called forth Hooker's Of the Laws of Ecclesiasticall Polity. The same insistence upon the developing form of law and revelation, corresponding to the Covenant contained in the Old and New Testaments, is the center of Baro's first book. The concept of law as an arbitrary thing that could be exactly codified for every case and situation is one of the driving elements behind the Calvinistic scholasticism with which Baro and Hooker were both to clash.[1] For the Puritan theologian, that law was the Scripture, interpreted simply and literally in discipline and dogma. The more completely and rigidly one could formulate and fix dogma, the closer one came to the realization of truth. Thus at its first appearance even Laurence Chaderton hails Baro's wedding of Law and Theology.

---

[1] Ludham had already tried his hand at translating, although in a much less controversial work, in 1577 when he translated the Practise of Preaching of Andreas Hyperius. And in 1579 he had translated the same author's The Course of Christianitie.

The Praelectiones came out in a handsome folio volume, from the press of John Day, "Cum gratia & Privilegio Regiae Majestatis", and were dedicated to Grindal. There were also included: "3 Conciones ad Clerum Cantabrigiensem habitae, in Templo D. Mariae" and the two theses which Ludham later translated. There was also added the form of prayers used by Baro in his conciones, and a short treatise "adversus Missam & Transubstantiationem Papistarum", which has the separate date of 1578.

Baro was happy at Cambridge, and proud of his position, and of the University. And the University began by being pleased with him. For on April 15, 1579, as we are told in Athenae Cantabrigienses, the University by the pen of Charles Bill, deputy orator, addressed a Latin letter to secretaries

---

[1] See L. S. Thornton, Richard Hooker, A Study of his Theology, S.P.C.K., London, 1924. The same intent on a rational system was to lie behind the rise of science, although science managed to add the experimental method, a framework on which to determine facts in the material world, a recourse which the science of theology lacked. But for many years they were to flourish side by side, with the same faith in the eventual establishment of a complete system of law on both planes. So Isaac Newton devotes as much of his time to theology as to science. This concept of law, of the rationalistic structure of the Universe, was the dream of scientist and theologian alike.

Walsingham and Wilson, recommending Baro to their patronage. In his Concio I he makes Peace the subject of his sermon. He congratulates his hearers on the peace of the kingdom, and on the peace that reigns within the University:

> Ad PACEM ac Concordiam res omnes Superiores & Inferiores nos invitant: hoc Reipub. ratio & incolumitas: hoc Ecclesiae salus: hoc hujus Academiae, quae quasi Mater vestra est, Decus ac dignitas postulant; hoc Collegiorum vestrorum Fundatores, qui haec tam magnifica Collegia vobis extruxerunt, ut vix ulla sint in tota Europa, cum vestris conferenda, a vobis petunt, si eorum, jam mortuorum, voces exaudire velitis, quibus vos simul omnes, uno consensu ad Pacem atque concordiam cohortantur. [1]

But the lectures on Johah were, in their published form, to disappoint his confident hope that here in England he had found peace. He advanced his ideas on predestination there in seeming confidence, no more prominently than the many other subjects he launches upon: the authority and use of the Apocrypha, the old and new Covenants, the lawfulness of casting lots (it is lawful in so far as it allows God's providence to rule, as in dividing heritages and in distributing offices in the state, but not in judging causes or in deciding action, for then it is magic and diabolical)[2], Christ's descent into Hell, the doctrine of the Church. There is, he said, a conditional predestination and an absolute predestination, corresponding to God's working through conditional and absolute causation. God said "Forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed", and yet Nineveh was not destroyed.[3] His full reasoning on the subject is, of course, contained in the first thesis he defends on the freedom of the will, where he summarizes the philosophers and theologians at length. Here he was apparently unanswerable, for the later attack comes on the statement he bases on this philosophic foundation: "it is the will of God we should have eternal life, if we believe and persevere in the faith of Christ; but if we do not believe, or believing only for a time, do not persevere, then it is not the will of God we should be saved."[1] Here is the test issue for Arminianism for the next fifty years, and I shall have many occasions to cite it as it recurs again and again. It involves the perpetuity of faith in the elect. Any suggestion that the elect might fall from grace "aut finaliter aut totaliter" will be enough to bring the full attack of the High Calvinists upon the holder of this doctrine. The outlines of Baro's doctrinal position will come out in my subsequent recital of events, so I shall leave it for the moment at this hasty summary.

---

[1] Page 299.
[2] Praelectio xiii.
[3] In 1594, as Heylyn notes in his Quinquarticular History,

It is apparent, then, that the publication of Baro's Praelectiones represents the beginning of the open disagreement at Cambridge that was to culminate in the Lambeth Articles. John Bingham, who writes to Grotius in 1615 to answer his questions about the Lambeth Articles,[2] says he

---

(page 606) Dr. John King, who later became Bishop of London, delivered some lectures on Jonah at York, which used the same examples to qualify the doctrine of High Calvinism. He too divides the purpose of God into two parts, one disclosed, one secret.

[1] Page 217.

[2] See page 37, Note 1, above.

was a student at Cambridge at the time.[1] He dates them in fact before the publication of the Praelectiones, although he is wrong in putting them "circa annum 82". He adds:

> ...cum longo post temporis intervallo haberetur disputatio Lambethana e qua nati sunt illi eiusdem nominis articuli.[2]

Bingham's impression of the date as 1582 comes from the fact that the first open quarrel in the long process came in an outbreak between Baro and Chaderton in 1581. Chaderton had apparently approved of the Praelectiones fully, for his verses prefixed to it show no hesitation in praising both Baro and his doctrines:

Rhetora, Gramaticum, Logicum fecere Baronem
  Dictio culta, Loqui purius, Ordo bonus.
Hisce Baron, Gravitas rerum quem reddit onustum,
Plura scit. Hunc dubitem dicere jure BA'PY'N
  Ut taceam quod sit Gallus, Romanus & idem
Graecus, ab Hebraeo singula fonte petit.
Omnia perfecte Definit, dividit aeque,
  Ingenioq; videt. judicioq; locat,
Omnia perspicuis Verbis, & Mente libenti,
  Doctorem ut possis dicere rite, docet.
Hoc velut amissum quaerent, docente repertum,
  E tenebris Jonas conspiciendus adest.
Prodiit ut quondam Monstri de vente marini
  Ut Ninivitarum Moenia salva forent.

Yet in his De Fide, which appeared in 1580, Baro indicates in his prefatory address to Osmund Lake that his comparison of the Ninevites to the elect of England, and his arguing from their lack of faith that even the Elect could at times be wanting, had raised a storm. He says there:

---

[1] "De controversia inter Whitakerum et Baronem, quamvis, cum primum nasceretur, Cantabrigiae commorarer, plenam tamen narrationem nequeo pertexere."

[2] Here Grotius, as the editor notes, has corrected the date in the margin, putting down "1595".

> Cum viderem ex nostris in Jonam Praelectionibus, in aliquam nos, etiam apud amicos, venisse suspicionem, charissime atque observande Frater, id non mea tantum, sed tua etiam causa, qui eas in lucem emisisti, aegre tuli. 1

Therefore he has given all his attention to re-examining this subject to be sure of what he knows, and in this book, he says, he seeks to satisfy all his critics.

What especially roused the wrath of the other party was Baro's *Praelectio* xxxi, in which he affirmed that, although the Ninevites were not within the Covenant (*foedus*), yet they were not altogether rejected. In the *De Fide* Baro puts it that faith was implicit in the Ninevites, and stands by his claim that God is merciful.

The *De Fide* is an attempt to determine the source of faith, and the steps to come to it. It is a philosophic rather than a wholly theological argument. He analyzes at some length the causes of faith. Included also are some reflections on the relation of law and faith, and of the old problem of faith and works. He affirms that works are necessary, in the usual Protestant fashion, *after* faith, but necessary nevertheless. He affirms, however, also, that faith is commanded by the law of God. This was another shock to the whole Calvinist concept of Christian Liberty, and the book roused one E. H. to an abusive answer, which, however, was not published until 1592, probably as part of the campaign leading up to the time of the Lambeth Articles. The author

---

1 This book was dedicated to Sir Francis Walsingham by Osmund Lake, who dates his dedication from Ringwood, 14 May, 1580.

here agrees with only one statement of Baro's about faith, and that is his claim that salvation is through the gospel only. For the rest he begins by professing himself to be horrified at what untruths people in these days can utter without contradiction. Baro has, he charges, not distinguished the law of life, from the law of the Decalogue. The book of God, he must conclude, is entirely closed to Baro![1]

Part of this indictment is directed at Baro's De Praestantia et Dignitate Divinae Legis, which had appeared in 1586. Of this book E. H. says; "Vix enim credibile dictu est, quam tu in eo opere coelum terra misceas!" It is "Aeternum monumentum ignorationis & caecitatis tuae."[2] This was a long and careful treatise on the relationship and relative validity of the Old and New Law. Baro's dedication to Whitgift summarizes all the errors which he here wishes to refute. It is in good rhetorical form, with his propositions stated first, with all the objections that might be raised met in turn, and then the result summarized. He apologizes in the beginning to the reader for having cited so many authorities, but as a matter of fact his citations are few in comparison with those of Perkins and Ames. Calvin is the authority most frequently cited. In Chapter 24 he finds Calvin and Chrysostom in disagreement, and with some hesitation decides against Calvin on the ground that he has made an emendation in the translation of a Bible text that is not justified, merely to make it suit his doctrine.

---

[1] The full title of this attack is: De Fide, Eiusque Ortu et Natura Contra P. Baronis Stempani, Theologie in Academia Cantab. professoris, praelectionem...per E. H. seruum Domini Iesu Christi Londini...1592. It was reprinted in what is called a third edition by "Autore T. L." in 1653, bound up with a translation signed T. S. It is printed at that time as part of a collection of other tracts by this T. L. called A Voyce Out of the Wilderness, of 1651, which consists of four tracts: an address to the Church of Rome, one addressed to Queen Elizabeth, one to Essex, and one to King James, all dealing with interpretations of the Scriptures, concerning the prophecies of the end of the world etc. The editor of this collection does not identify this man T. L., except to add at the end: "He lived (as appeares by his Bookes) in the dayes of Queen Elizabeth, and was once a Student in the University of Cambridge; which afterwards, rejecting all expectations of preferments in this world, he forsook, and purposely obscured himself, in the mean and low Estate of a Shepherd:"

[2] Pages 65-66.

What the De Praestantia is trying to do is to retain the validity of the Old Law at the same time as it asserts the superior power of the New. The tendency of the sects was to say that the New Law had made the Old Law unnecessary; Baro insists that the latter still has its place. What brought the High Calvinists down upon him was the principle he deduced from this, that justification was not only the free gift of Christ, but was also included in the observation of the Old Law.

It is hard to conceive that Chaderton did not know what was in the Praelectiones when he wrote his verses, or, (judging from the last line) the direction that Baro's interpretation of the story of Jonah was to take. It may be that the De Fide of 1580 roused his opposition. It seems from the details that he quite suddenly appeared in the pulpit and attacked his old friend's doctrines. The sudden change is puzzling. The only explanation I can think of fits in with the theory that the attack on Baro, and the Lambeth Articles, are parts of the Puritan movement.

Chaderton was born in a Catholic family in 1536 or 1538 and had been educated at Cambridge; he was to become the Grand Old Man of Puritanism before his death in 1640. He was one of the early lecturers of the Puritan party, filling that post in the afternoons at St. Clement's in Cambridge for nearly fifty years. Although Mullinger, as we have seen, names him as prominent in putting down the Genevan revolt in Cambridge, Usher is sure that he was one of the ring-leaders in the first conventicles.[1] In 1584 Sir Walter Mildmay was to found Emmanuel College expressly for him, and it was to become the stronghold of Puritanism for the next fifty years at Cambridge. He was a product of Christ's College, the tutor of William Perkins, and he was to be one of the Puritan representatives at Hampton Court in 1604, where he faced his old college friend, Bancroft, whose life it was said he had once saved in a town-and-gown riot. The McAlpin Collection includes A fruitfull Sermon dated 1584, ascribed to him, which is a violent attack on the institution of Bishops, putting them in the category of excrescences, and begging the Queen to call in the preachers to advise her how she may build up the walls of Jerusalem by expelling bishops out of it. Why he suddenly turns upon Baro at this point is hard to understand. The author of the attack on De Fide represents it as Baro's own fault. He says:

---

[1] Usher's contention is more reasonable, especially since Strype lists Chaderton as the representative for Cambridge at a 'synod' of disciplinarians which met at Warwick or Cambridge on September 8, 1587, to settle the Puritan discipline in the various counties under superintendents. (Annals, Ib, pp. 690 ff.) Mullinger tends to ascribe every revolt against University discipline at this time to the activities of Puritans. See also Knappen's Tudor Puritanism, p. 471.

> Call to minde, with mee, that day, wherein applauding your selfe, in your owne subtleties, you provoked One in the University; to whom, when it was not lawfull to answer or reply sufficiently unto you making the Challenge, either for the authority of your party, or for the obscurity of your sophistry, and snares of your subtleties. Good God! how you crowed and insulted over the man? neither did you think it sufficient onely, this your poore Lecture, to be published, in Triumph of this so sordid a victory, that it might obscure the right; except also, in the sixth year after, (dancing as it were, at the funeralls of truth) you caused to be published a new commentary, of the Excellency and dignity of the Law, An eternall monument of your ignorance, and blindnesse. 1

Strype, however, represents Chaderton as taking the initiative. He says:

> Peter Baro, a Frenchman by birth, was now Lady Margaret professor at Cambridge; whose doctrine about universal redemption somewhat varied from, or thwarted some of the articles received in the Church of England, as some of the learned there thought: among the rest, Lawrence Chaderton, B.D. a fellow of a college there; who preached publicly against those tenets of that professor, in a sermon of which William Dillingham...gives this account:
>
> 'That his nova dogmata, brought with him into England, dissonant from the truth and doctrine of the church of England, he refuted in a sermon, being then bachelor of divinity. For which Baro cited him into the consistory before the vice-chancellor and other heads, by arguments written by him in his own defence. Which Chaderton learnedly and acutely answered.'
>
> Baro's theses were these: Primus Dei amor est de natura fidei justificantis.
>
> Fides justificans praecipitur in Decalogo.

---

1 From the 1653 translation, page 70. In 1600 it was the High Calvinists who made an attack on Overall under much the same circumstances as here described. See below p.114.

> Chaderton defended the contrary. But afterwards they seemed each of them to come nearer to one another by softer words; and yet both abounding ing their own sense....In the conclusion he [Chaderton] thus declared himself to the heads: 'That God was witness, that in these cases he neither publicly nor privately spake any thing, either out of a study of contradiction, or with any mind of speaking evil of any man, but only publicly to teach and defend the true doctrine of the church of England, (of which he professed himself a member, though least of all,) that had been impugned by a man, however dear to him: especially the sense of the place of scripture, which he took for his text, requiring it.' 1

Dillingham's Life of Chaderton is not much more detailed on the subject of this incident than Strype represents it to be. He does add that Perkins was one of the first pupils of Chaderton, which will be of significance to note in what follows; he emphasizes the great personal affection that existed between Baro and Chaderton during the course of the dispute, and he corrects the error of Fuller, in his History of Cambridge, who in the statement of the theses of Baro put in a non where it did not belong, thus completely misrepresenting the positions of the two.[2] Fuller's recital is as follows:

> A contest happened between Mr Chadderton (afterward Master of Emmanuel College) and Dr Baro, Margaret-Professor, about some heterodox opinions, vented by the same Baro both in his readings and print, namely, in his Comment on Jonah, and book De Fide.
>
> Whereupon, the Doctor (Baro) procured Mr Chadderton to be called into the Consistory, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr Hawford, Dr Harvey, and Dr Legge, where he utterly denied he had ever preached against the Doctor; but he propounded these questions as erroneous and false: 1. Primus Dei amor non

---

1 Annals III, i, 68.

2 William Dillingham, Life of Laurence Chaderton, tr, E. S. Schuckburgh, Cambridge, 1884.

> est in natura fidei justificantis. 2. Fides justificans non praecipitur in decalogo.
>
> Many papers in Latin passed betwixt them, and at last they were conceived to come nearer together in these their expressions; the originals being kept in the University-library:...1

There follow the statements by which they were made to agree in the interpretation of these two principles. But Fuller adds:

> Now, however they might seem in terms to approach, their judgments were so far asunder that it set their affections at the same distance, so that no compliance betwixt them, and the Doctor at last outed of his place; whereof hereafter.

Baro in his letter to Whitgift of February 4, 1596, describes the cause of the quarrel and Chaderton's resentment against him thus, in Strype's summary:

> ...namely that he [Baro] defended and shewed against him [Chaderton] that faith was commanded by the law, the book being dedicated to his Grace's name. And that hence certainly it was, that taking hold of this occasion from his sermon, they moved everything against him. 2

The important thing to notice here is that although Baro's writings published up to this time had contained his full doctrine of predestination, and of the freedom of the will, the attack is opened upon him only in terms of that most basic of Protestant doctrines, Justification by Faith. His emphasis on law seems to undermine this doctrine. It is only later that the High Calvinists move to attack him on the grounds of his doctrine of predestination. We shall note the issues as they come up.

---

1 Thomas Fuller, The History of the University of Cambridge, ed. James Nichols, London, 1840, pages 203-204.

2 Strype, Whitgift, II, 307.

Anthony à Wood, in Fasti Oxonienses, is more full in his recital of the charges that were brought against Baro at this time. He apparently confused some of the later charges with those which arose at this time, but we may analyze them as he lists them, for indications of how well-founded they were. He says:

> (1) That in his readings upon Jonah, he taught the popish doctrine of the co-operation of faith and works to justification; which, tho' in terms a little changed, yet the doctrine was one and the same effect.
> (2) That he laboured to make men believe that the reformed church's doctrine was not so differing from popish doctrine, but that by distinctions they might be reconciled, and therefore concluded that both professions might be tolerated.
> And (3) that in his said readings he taught that the heathen may be saved without the faith of the gospel, and other strange matters, which they looked upon as damnable errors, &c. Besides, also, as they observed, that after many years, wherein he had sundry ways hurt the sincerity of the doctrine, he brought the popish schoolmen into credit, and diminished the honour of the learned writers of that age.

Baro's crime under the first head is evidently the fact that he dares mention works at all in connection with justification. In the Praelectiones he stoutly affirms throughout that faith is the prime requisite, but that only "fides fructivera justificat".[1] Without works, there is, in other words, no way of knowing that one is of the faith that justifies. Baro's inclination to Rome has been deduced from an eloquent plea he makes for tolerance, in Praelectio xviii. His argument there is that since we all worship the same God it is hard to understand why we must so disagree. He insists, however, that there are strong reasons why Protestants must disagree with Rome. His real argument is that there must be agreement among Protestants. He says:

---

[1] Page 180.

> Nostrum est igitur officium, quia Christiani sumus, Christum imitari, nec cito commoveri, ac patienter ferre eos etiam qui a nobis dissentiunt, ut ait Paulus 2 Tim. 2.24. primum ne forte ipsi erremus ubi non existimamus, quotidie enim discimus, & posterior dies est priore sapientiori: deinde ut, si illi errent, & e Diaboli laqueo elapsi, ut ibi loquitur Paulus, resipiscant. [1]

The third charge can also be documented. In discussing the Church, as I have mentioned in another chapter, Baro makes the conventional distinction between the visible and the invisible church. But for him the invisible church includes not only the elect who are of the visible church of England, Scotland, France, etc., with those who are in glory, but also the elect wherever they may be throughout the world, even in Turkey or among the barbarians. Though they may have no use of sacraments or any external ministry, they are nevertheless members of the catholic church.[2] Baro is here following where his logic leads him, but he is also following the lead of Christian humanism, and setting the objectives for the attempts at unification of the churches which will be followed all through the seventeenth century.

The violent outburst that took Baro by surprise in 1581 and against which, as I have noted, he seems to have felt strong enough to take the offensive, found another object in that same year. It was Richard Hooker. It is apparent from this coincidence that the attack by Chaderton on Baro is ordered by the same directives that run the campaign instituted by Travers against Hooker, for they are both arguing from the same doctrinal bases. In 1581 Hooker was appointed to preach at Paul's Cross. Of this sermon, Walton says:

---

[1] Page 124.
[2] Pages 179 ff.

> And in this first public appearance to the world, he was not so happy as to be free from exceptions against a point of doctrine delivered in his sermon, which was 'That in God there were two wills; an antecedent, and a consequent will: his first will, that all mankind should be saved; but his second will was, that those only should be saved, that did live answerable to that degree of grace which he had offered or afforded them.' This seemed to cross a late opinion of Mr Calvin's, and then taken for granted by many that had not a capacity to examine it, as it had been by him before... [1]

This concept of the antecedent and consequent wills in God was to be the basis for Hooker's attack on predestination also,[2] and the ground for his assertion of a doctrine of freedom of the will. Keble notes that

> In 1595, Dr Baro, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, was attacked for preaching the same doctrine almost in the same words. [3]

The fact is, however, that Baro had preached this same doctrine in almost the same words before 1579 in defending the first of the three theses reproduced in the *Praelectiones*: "Dei Decretum non tollit pravae Voluntatis libertatem." He there summarizes the discussions of the philosophers and then those of the theologians on the question of the freedom of the will. His basic argument is from the distinction I have before noted, between necessary and contingent causes, the distinction with which Bacon separated the realms of reason and faith. In his sermons on Jonah, Baro is consistent in applying the same reasoning to the question of predestination. God's decree about Nineveh was a contingent one. The will of man operates in the realm of contingent causes, and in that sense the decree of God can be affected by the will and actions of man. If this is not admitted, God is made the author of sin, and this he will shape all his doctrine to avoid saying.

---

[1] Keble's *Hooker* I, 29.
[2] See the *Fragments of an Answer to the Letter of Certain English Protestants*, in the Everyman edition of the *Polity*, Book V, 490 ff., especially pp. 507 ff., where the argument against absolute predestination follows exactly the lines that Baro's does.
[3] *Ibid*., p. 30 n.

Walton concludes the description of this doctrine of Hooker with the comment: "How he justified this I will not undertake to declare...." This Walton had to say, because he himself did not know, For he is using as his source here Hooker's Answer to Travers' Supplication to the Council, in which Hooker says:

> Touching the first point of his discovery, which is about the matter of predestination, to set down that I spake, (for I have it written) to declare and confirm the several branches thereof, would be tedious now in this writing, when I have so many things to touch that I can but touch them only. Neither is it herein so needful for me to justify my speech, when the very place and presence where I spake, doth itself speak sufficiently for my clearing. This matter was not broached in a blind alley, or uttered where none was to hear it, that had skill with authority to control, or covertly insinuated by some gliding sentence.
>
> That which I taught was at Paul's Cross; it was not huddled in amongst other matters, in such sort that it could pass without noting; it was opened,

> it was proved, it was some reasonable time stood upon. I see not which way my Lord of London, who was present and heard it, can excuse so great a fault [Aylmer, consecrated March 24, 1576-7; died June 3, 1594.], as patiently without rebuke or controlment afterwards, to hear any man there teach otherwise than 'the word of God doth', not as it is understood by the private interpretation of some one or two men, or by a special construction received in some few books, but as it is understood 'by all the Churches professing the gospel'; by them all, and therefore even by our own also amongst others. A man that did mean to prove that he speaketh, would surely take the measure of his words shorter. [1]

Here we have an answer to the question of why Baro feels he can take the initiative in defending himself against the attack of Chaderton. For he was sure that the prevailing party in the Church would agree with him, as it agreed with Hooker. These points were not brought up against Hooker until 1586, when he entered upon his ministry at the Temple, and the issue was joined with Walter Travers. It is to be assumed that this reasoning which Baro had been the first to voice was seen to be gaining ground more rapidly than the High Calvinists liked.[2]

---

[1] Keble, III, 717-718.

[2] Hooker is almost never cited by either side in the Arminian-Puritan arguments of 1625-70. Prynne, in his Anti-Arminianisme of 1630, cited The Ecclesiasticall Polity V, 49, as showing that Hooker was a believer in absolute predestination. Hooker is there commenting upon the Prayer for 'Mercy upon all men' against which thre Puritans had protested. However, although Hooker there admits that "...life and death have divided between them the whole body of mankind", the whole section is a rebuke to the extension of the doctrine of predestination which brought about the Arminian reaction. "What portion either of the two hath, God himself knoweth; for us he hath left no sufficient means to comprehend, and for that cause neither given any leave to search in particular who are infallibly the heirs of the kingdom of God, who castaways." Prynne does not expand upon the mere citation he makes. He had not included it in the 1629 edition.

The other points that Anthony a Wood cites as the points of attack upon Baro turn up in almost the same terms in the attack made by Walter Travers upon Hooker in 1586. Travers complained that Hooker had said that the Church of Rome was a true Church, 'although not a pure and perfect Church,' and 'That he doubted not but that thousands of the Fathers, which lived and died in the superstitions of that Church, were saved, because of their ignorance, which excused them;' In the list that Walton printed in an early edition of his Life of Hooker,[1] of the 'unsound Points of of Doctrine at divers times delivered by Mr. Hooker in his public Sermons', we have this assertion joined to one which says (No. 12): "Predestination is not of the absolute will of God, but conditional;" as well as (No. 13): "The doings of the wicked are not of the will of God positive, but only permissive; "and (No. 15): "The reprobates are not rejected, but for the evil works which God did foresee they would commit." The first of these charges evidently brought in for Hooker, as they had for Baro, the question of faith and works. Walton has a long passage summarizing Hooker's doctrine on this subject, of which he obviously himself does not realize the pertinence, for he manages to express it so that it makes no sense outside the historical context. But with the statement of Baro in the Praelectiones in mind, it is clear that Hooker is saying the same thing as Baro when, in Walton's words, "...he states the question about justification and works, and how the foundation of faith without works is overthrown;"[1]

---

[1] Keble's Hooker, I, 75-76.

Even the charge of being seduced by the Schoolmen turns up against Hooker, this time in 1599 in the Christian Letter. The authors say:

> Have we not cause to fear that the wittie schoolmen have seduced you, and by their conceited distinctions made you forget 'That you are neither able nor worthie to open and looke into the booke of God's law, by which he guideth the worlde?' And yet you will say, There is in God an occasioned will.

Hooker's answer is:

> The booke of that law I presume no farther to looke into, then all men may and ought thereof to take notise. I have not adventured to ransack the bosome of God, and to search out what is there to be read concerning every particular man, as some have done. 2

This is a tangled web I am following, in which one statement can seemingly be twisted into its opposite. The doctrine of the two wills in God, as I have shown, can be used to justify a distinction in the doctrine of predestination which the High Calvinists are not going to allow, as the theology of the English Church develops. All the attacks of the High Calvinists in these early phases of the conflict, however, are aimed at preserving their version of the dignity and privileges of the elect. If a Roman Catholic cannot be said without question or appeal to be damned out of hand, where is the distinction of the spiritual shock-troops, the elect? If there were some things that operated by natural causes, where was the Divine Providence that moved everything and worked all things for the elect? This could not be allowed. The next step was that a doctrine of the Church would develop by which a man might make out his own salvation, and the elect could be made by the power of the bishops. In fact, however, the High Calvinists take the offensive, and they develop the doctrine about which most of the quarreling is to center for the rest of its history. That is the absolute certainty and perpetuity of faith in the elect. This question had not arisen in the early phase, but the way in which it was attached to the doctrine of the two kinds of will in God is shown in the words Hooker uses in his early sermon, (probably his earliest extant work, Keble says,) on the "Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect". There he says:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 70.
[2] Ibid., II, 275, note 61.

> The reason which is taken from the power of the Spirit were effectual, if God did work like a natural agent, as the fire doth inflame, and the sun enlighten, according to the uttermost ability which they have to bring forth their effects. But the incomprehensible wisdom of God doth limit the effects of his power to such a measure as seemeth best unto himself. Wherefore he worketh that certainty in all, which sufficeth abundantly to their salvation in the life to come; but in none so great as attaineth in this life unto perfection. 1

The High Calvinists had to break down this doctrine of two wills in God because it not only let in a modification of absolute predestination, but it also involved the possibili-

---

1 *Ibid.*, III, 587. I have not space more than to point out again how this aspect of the question of predestination was the opening for the beginnings of science.

ty that the elect were not chosen and sustained at every step and move by the will of God, but that they might also be subject to natural laws, and capable of falling. The High Calvinists thus come to accuse anyone of heresy who implies that the elect can ever fall from grace, either totally or finally.

I have referred before to the thesis of John Keble (to which later commentators have given the consent of silence) that Hooker's doctrine changed in the course of his defence of the institutions of the Church. I think that conclusion must now be modified. It seems to me that when Hooker begins writing his defence of the English Church, his doctrines are pretty well set in the liberal mold of a school which has been expressing itself thus since about 1575. It is the doctrine that is coming to the defence of the Church, not the Church to the doctrine.[1] It may well be that Whitgift had recognized that fact when he chose Hooker to write his book. For Whitgift was later prepared to defend the men in the Church who held that doctrine.

The attack on the extreme doctrine of predestination which Hooker and Baro had begun was not lost on those who were planning their careers in the Church and State. One of these was Samuel Harsnett, who became chaplain to Bancroft when the latter was Bishop of London, and, in 1628, Archbishop of York. In the year he took his degree at Pembroke, 1584, he delivered a sermon at Paul's Cross which violently attacked the doctrine of absolute predestination. He said:

---

[1] What does change in Hooker is his concept of the Church. I agree with Keble that he changes his concept of the validity and nature of the sacraments in the course of writing the Polity, but even here one must emphasize that Hooker never becomes as High Church as Keble claims he does.

> There is a conceit abroad in the World speaks little better of our gracious God than this, and that is, that God should design many thousands of souls to Hell before they were, not in eye to their faults, but to his own absolute will and power, and to get him glory in their damnation. This opinion is grown high and monstrous, and like a Goliah, and men do shake and tremble at it; yet never a man reacheth to David's sling to cast it down. In the name of the Lord of Hosts we will encounter it, for it hath reviled not the Host of the living God, but the Lord of Hosts. 1

He bases his attack on the fact that "It is a law of Nations that no man innocent shall be condemned"; how much less can a good God be conceived of in terms of Absolute Reprobation. He ends with six 'consequences': (1) Sin is the cause of Reprobation; not God's absolute will. (2) No man is such a child of Hell that he may not avoid it. (3) God simply wills that every soul be saved and come to the Kingdom of Heaven. (4) He sent his son to accomplish it. (5) He offers Grace effectually to save every one and direct him to the Kingdom of Heaven. (6) Neglect of this grace, not God's privative decree is the reason why anyone does not come to the Kingdom of Heaven.

---

1 This is appended to "Three Sermons preached by...Dr. Richard Stuart...", London, 1658, second ed. The fact that it was published so late, that there is no contemporary record of it, nor any mention of Harsnett in the theological arguments of the time have made me suspect its genuineness. However, since it has been misplaced in the McAlpin Collection and could not be located, I have not had an opportunity to examine it. I have used Heylyn's summary of its points.

Heylyn, as might be expected, quotes from this sermon at length in his Quinquarticular History, and denies Prynne's claim that Harsnett was convented for it. In this case Prynne seems to be correct. In the Lords Journals for May 19, 1624, it is reported that Harsnett said he was "checked by the Lord Archbishop Whitgift and commanded to preach no more of it, and he never did, though now Dr. Abbot, late bishop of Sarum, hath since declared in print that which he then preached to be no Popery."[1] However, there seems to be no record of his having been convented for it at Cambridge. At the time of the formal proceedings against Baro his name is listed among the witnesses called to testify to Baro's having delivered the doctrines imputed to him,[2] but it appears that he supported Baro as far as he could.[3] He was apparently not noted for personal courage - witness his actions at the time that John Hayward's Henry IIII caused that ill-fated historian to be sent to the Tower. As Bancroft's chaplain, Harsnett had passed the book, and he too was threatened with imprisonment. He managed to convince Coke of his innocence by an obsequious letter.

There is evidence, however, that at this time he was fully enlisted on the side of Baro and his party. A manuscript which cannot be dated, although it is bound up with the record of the proceedings against John Overall about

---

[1] Cited in DNB.
[2] Heywood and Wright, Cambridge Transactions, I, 95.
[3] DNB. I have found no evidence in my investigations of Harsnett's very active support of Baro, however.

1600, contains two theses which Harsnett defended in debates at Cambridge. One is entitled *Nemo necessario damnatur*, the other *Certitudo uniuscujusque salutis non est certitudo fidei*.[1] He attacks *has duas pestes*, the doctrine of Absolute Reprobation, and the necessary salvation of the elect, as *infestissimae religioni*.

The importance of his statements in his sermon lies in the fact that it gives the perspective from which the party Baro represented saw the issues. The doctrine of absolute predestination is not something established which they are attempting to change. It is a development which is rising up from an alien theology, attempting to take over and dominate the official doctrine of the church, which had not reached to that extreme before.

It may be well to finish out the list of Baro's works before continuing with my recital of the events which lead to the making of the Lambeth Articles. There are only two which I have not mentioned, neither of which was published during Baro's lifetime. His *Summa Trium de Praedestinatione Sententiarum*, was written before 1596,[2] but was not published until 1613, when it was hastily printed with Piscator's, Junius', and Whitaker's comments on predestination and the Lambeth Articles, at Hardrovic in the Netherlands, and sent to England to help carry the day for the Counter-Remonstrants at the time of Grotius' mission to England. I shall mention the circumstances in their place. Baro here lists the opinions as: first, that of Calvin and Beza, second, that of Augustine (at the end of his life, after his contest with Pelagius), Zanchius, and Bellarmine, the redoubtable Cardinal against whom Whitaker and Andrewes wrote. Baro claims that these both impose on men an inevitable necessity and give rise to 'numberless absurdities'. Their only difference is that between the supra-lapsarians and the infra-lapsarians, although Baro does not use those terms. He himself holds to the third opinion, which he identifies as that of the Fathers before Augustine, and of Augustine himself before his contest with Pelagius. Here he establishes the saving basis which is the foreknowledge of God. God has willed to save those who he foreknew would believe in Christ. Melanchthon, Hemmingius, and Gellius Snecanus of Friesland are those who hold this version of the decrees. The two great principles are that it is the will of God that all men be saved and that none perish, and that Christ has died for all; God hates men not as being man but as being a sinner. He also makes here the connection between the two wills of God and the doctrine of predestination. The antecedent will of God is that the Gospel should be published to every creature. It is of God and his 'mere grace' that certain individuals are saved; it is through their own perverseness and sin that others are damned. This is the consequent will of God "because it is a consequence of the impenitency of men who persevere in sin."[1]

---

[1] BM MS Harl. 3142, f. 92, 54a-61b.

[2] He sent it in that year with a letter to Nicholas Hemmingius, a Danish theologian. See page 218 below.

---

[1] Translated in The Works of James Arminius, ed. James Nichols, Auburn and Buffalo, 1853, three volumes, I, 91 ff.

The other work of Baro's which remains is in manuscript in the University Library, Cambridge, entitled *Cur fructus mortis Christi ad omnes Adami posteros non perveniat.*[1] Watt has dated it about 1594, but there is no evidence to support such a date. It is directed toward proving that God cannot be the author of sin, and toward refuting in dignified terms the contentions of Beza, Again, in introducing the subject of his thesis, he brings in the antecedent and consequent will of God. He says:

> Pereunt ergo qui pereunt, contra Antecedentem quidem, illam Dei voluntatem, Christiq. Beneficium; attamen non contra Consequentem hanc et secundariam, qua Christus ipse Potestati sibi a Patre demandata, fit in ipsos sententiam ultimo die in hunc modum laturus;...

He cites both Calvin and Beza to prove that God was not the author of Adam's fall. The reason that the fruit of Adam's death, and that of the second Adam, Christ, does not extend automatically to all men is that all men have free will, and their sin is the only cause of reprobation. He adds at the end some further remarks: "Alia ejusdem Questionis in eundem sensam explicatio; Cur omnes non sustenantur a Christo?"

Watt in *Bibliotheca Britannica* lists also a title which I have not found listed anywhere else, or indeed referred to: *Tractatulus de Regimine seu cavitate principium*, London, by Wynken de Worde, 4to.[2] I can only conclude that he is mistaken.

The strength and terms of the reaction to High Calvinism at this early date adds more certainty to the reasons that have been advanced for the growth of the Federal Theology which Professor Miller has outlined in detail in The New England Mind.[1] The name of William Perkins is to appear in the course of these quarrels which lead to the Lambeth Articles, and he was among the first who formulated the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace. Professor Miller implies that the impulse to the formulation of the doctrine came from Arminius. However it will be apparent, as my recital proceeds, that the strength of English Arminianism was enough to turn Perkins to the task. Perkins died in 1602, before the doctrines of Arminius came into prominence, and Arminius was accepted as professor at Leyden by Gomarus, who became his theological arch-enemy, as late as 1604. In 1598 Arminius wrote his Examen Modestum Praedestinationis Perkinsianae, a refutation of Perkins' De praedestinationis modo et ordine, but he was disappointed that Perkins died before he could see it.[2] I think it will be clear from what follows that the criticism of High Calvinism which brought forth the theory of the Covenant of Grace came from within the Church of England, rather than from across the North Sea. Heylyn says in his Aerius Redivivus[3] that the quarrel which led to the Lambeth Articles arose because Perkins' Armilla Aurea of 1590 caused Baro to develop his opposite doctrine of predestination. However, as we shall see from the events that follow, and as I have noted in what has gone before, both Baro and Hooker have emphasized their criticism of absolute predestination as early as 1581. It is they who raise the questions which inspire Perkins' systematic development of the doctrine of the Covenant, and it is Perkins' and Whitaker's development of absolute predestination which brings out Baro's and Hooker's reactions. When Baro and Overall are complaining of Perkins' doctrines he is a minor figure, a University fellow, who is twisting the doctrine of the Church of England to extremes which make God the author of sin, and impudently controverting the preaching of his academic superiors in their own pulpits.

---

[1] ULC Gg.1.29, f. 46 ff.

[2] Robert Watt, *Bibliotheca Britannica*, four volumes, Edinburgh, 1824, I, 76. On the face of it, it is odd to find Baro associated with a printer of two generations earlier.

---

[1] Pages 366 ff.

[2] Hardwick (Hist. of the Articles, p. 193) claims that it was Perkins' Armilla Aurea of 1590 which Arminius answered, but both the title and the fact that a Dutch translation is known to have been made in 1598, makes Harrison's claim for De praedestinationis...more likely. At any rate it is almost certain that Perkins never knew of Arminius' existence.

[3] Page 340.

In the 1580's Baro continued, unmolested, his usual occupations in connection with his professorship. In 1585 when one John Smith M.A. was had up before the administration for a violent sermon advocating the Jewish Sabbath, Baro was among the professors who sat to hear the charges. Smith was directed to explain himself more fully in more orthodox terms in another sermon.[1] And on May 27, 1587, Baro was present at the meeting which decided to forbid any student to have anything to do with John Edmunds, mayor of the town of Cambridge, for "imo maximam ingratitudinem adversus academiam, scholares, et eorum famulos, exhibuisse, et exhibere".[2]

---

[1] Strype, Annals, III, i, 496.
[2] Ibid., III, ii, 496.

The division about the question of predestination crops up again, however. Strype notes the case in 1586 of a "religious assembly... (whereof one Glover was a chief, and, as it seems, a minister)" who were imprisoned for their opinions on justification and predestination. Burghley wrote a letter to Whitgift which effected their release. In Glover's letter of thanks to Burghley, Strype says, can be seen what their tenets were. He suggests that they were "...followers perhaps of Dr. Peter Baro, late Margaret Professor in Cambridge, and Corranus[1] before him." Strype prints the letter, which hardly supports his contention as far as Baro is concerned. But it does show that the dismay at the rigidity of Calvinist doctrines went beyond academic circles. Glover claims that they teach that all men to be justified must come to Christ. The sense of his statement on predestination is harder to unravel. He says:

---

[1] Corranus also comes into the accusation Travers makes against Hooker in his Supplication: "According to which determination, whereas he [Hooker] had taught certain things concerning predestination otherwise than the Word of God doth, as it is understood by all churches professing the gospel, and not unlike that wherewith Corranus sometime troubled this Church,..." Keble quotes Strype's Grindal (p. 185): "There was now [1568] in London one Corranus, (or Anthony de Corro) a Spaniard, a native of Seville, preacher to an assembly of Spanish protestants, (as he states in his Dedication of his Dialogue to the Students of the Temple,) though he himself was a member of the Italian congregation, to which one Hieronymus was preacher: ...a man of good learning, as Grindal testified of him, but of a hasty, and somewhat contentious spirit... had caused a Table, entitled De Operibus Dei, to be printed...wavering, as it seems, somewhat from the opinions of Calvin." He was suspended from his place on this account, but in 1571, by the interest of either Leicester or Bishop Sandys, he was made reader of Divinity in the Temple, "in which office" continues Keble, "...he continued about three years in much disquiet, and then came with letters of recommendation from Leicester to the university of Oxford: which received him after some scruple about his Pelagianism on the part of Reynolds, and others. There he remained as student in Ch. Ch. and Divinity reader in several halls until 1582; and died 1591, in London."

> The second is, that God hath from the beginning chosen in Christ and predestinate none to be in the state of salvation for that time as they are not predestinate to be in the state of charity and true repentance: as Mr Calvin newly hath written. 1

This is the same as to say that the elect must be in a state of charity to be elect at all, that the elect may fall from grace. Further:

> The third and last, that the vineyard of God and church of Christ is not given to such who profess in words only, but only to such who bring forth the fruits thereof in their season.

This is another way of saying what Baro had said, that only fides fructivera justificat, and is equally anathema to High Calvinism.

The final flare-up which led to the Lambeth Articles apparently had its beginnings about 1593, although Strype is the only one to be so specific about the date. He says, under the date 1595:

> But now arose a new contention, that appeared first at Cambridge about two years before, concerning some points of doctrine: as, whether true faith might fail; and whether every believer was sure of his salvation, &c. which seemed chiefly to be occasioned by the lectures of Dr Whitaker and Dr Baro,... 2

Strype reports that the Vice-Chancellor and Heads wrote to Whitgift "to interpose his influence and instruction to allay them [these disputes]." Whitaker apparently carried his

---

1 Annals, III, i, 634-635.
2 Whitgift, II, 227.

case to Lambeth in person, for it was he "...who delivered his Grace's message to the Vice-Chancellor; which was, to take some order, with the assistance of the governors of colleges, for the staying of these inconveniences."

It may be that Whitaker's defeat in his candidacy for the position of Master of Trinity in 1593 aroused him to this open debate. Perhaps he conceived that it was Baro's party which had defeated him. It is hard to know, with the documents we have available. At any rate, Baro has taken on an opponent now much more to be reckoned with than Chaderton, who was known more as a preacher than as a systematic theologian, an opponent who has moved the question to the grounds on which it will be fought out for the next fifty years: Can the elect fall from grace? It has appeared before, but now it begins to head the procession. If the elect are not fated to remain the elect, where then, asks the Calvinist, is the power of God? The Arminian answers that if the elect can be assured of their election so surely, no matter what sins they commit, where is the moral virtue of religion? The stressing of the moral element of religion is a growing influence on doctrine and theology at this time, and its growth is increased by the uncompromising stand that the High Calvinists took on this subject. But even more important is the connection of this doctrine with the social order which is the obsession of the Elizabethans. What the Anglicans fear is the disruptive force of the antinomian side of Calvinism. One of Hooker's bugbears in the Ecclesiasticall Polity is the Anabaptists, who, with the

Family of Love and the Brownists, loom as the social menace all through this part of the sixteenth century. Baro puts it in these terms in his thesis defending the freedom of the will which I have already cited. If all things occur by necessity, he says there, and there is no free will, then praise and blame are useless, as well as honors and punishment, all of which are the mainstays of government. This explains a great deal of why Arminianism became and remained upper-class and conservative: it was the doctrine of social responsibility, of citizens who would look on the voice of the ruler and magistrate as the voice of God, whose responsibility to God would go through the ruler.

It must be emphasized also, however, that in the setting of Elizabethan theology, the propaganda advantage on this issue is with the High Calvinists. It would seem the other way around to us, but the sense of being elect is of the essence of the Protestant position at the Reformation and it is fully ingrained in the English mind by the 1590's. The burden of proof is upon him who would contend that the elect _can_ fall from grace.

Baro comes to the conventional conclusion that the High Calvinists tend toward Anabaptism in this doctrine. Strype reports:

> But concerning these questions and controversies as yet there was small hope of good issue; as Dr Whitaker, being returned to Cambridge, wrote to the Archbishop, June the 13th. And that of late in their Schools they had a determination, 'That justifying grace and faith might not only be lost in some _finally_, but even in the elect, for a time _totaliter_. And that this was proved by the example of David. And P. Martyr and Calvin were alleged as

> teaching the same: whom all men, he [Whitaker] said, knew to be of a clean contrary judgment. And there was one insinuation given, that we (said the same Professor) who teach and have always taught otherwise, are Anabaptists. I was present, (added he) and heard it with mine ears, to my great grief.

He asks Whitgift, finally, "...to repress, by his authority, these ungodly proceedings." Strype also reports as part of this battle a sermon at St. Mary's, ad clerum "...upon the like points; viz., about the indeficiency of faith, final perseverance, sin the proper cause of reprobation &c." which he does not date, nor does he identify the preacher. But it is evident that it must be Baro or one of his party.

Baro is not yet at the point where he will dare to say that the elect can fall from grace finally; he will only say that it is possible for them to fall for a time, totally.

It is apparent from several pieces of evidence that Baro is by this time head of a considerable party, and the fact that the small outburst of 1593 seems to have ended in a draw would indicate that the High Calvinists regarded themselves as outnumbered and that they hesitated to make anything more of it at the time. Perhaps both principals were ordered to stay off the subject. As Heylyn puts it:

> And it seems also by that Letter [the Heads to Burghley] that Baroe had not sown his seed in a barren soil, but in such as brought forth fruit enough and yielded a greater increase of Followers, than the Calvinians could have wished. For in one place the Letter tells us, that besides Mr Barret... 'There were divers others who there attempted publickly to teach new and Strange Opinions in Religion', as the Subscribers of it call them. 1

---

1 Quinquarticular History, p. 617.

It is to Baro that they look to set the measure of their tactics. For when Barrett has promised to make a second recantation, and has come back to Cambridge to do it, in January of 1596, it is Baro's sermon ad clerum of January 12th which, as Strype says,

> created some fears that Baret would after all decline making the said confession and acknowledgement. For so the Vice-Chancellor wrote to the Archbishop at the same time, that since that unhappy accident, (as he called Baro's sermon,) he much doubted conference would not do him so much good, as that late sermon had done him (among others) hurt and hinderance. 1

Thanks, perhaps, to the support Baro's doctrines lent to the hand of civil, government, Barrett found powerful friends, apparently, at Court. Whitgift, writing to Goad after the sermon I have mentioned above, tells Goad to keep the matter to himself, but

> That he doubted indeed that he [Baro] had received some kind of encouragement from some that seemed to make some account of his judgment in these points, and talked their pleasure thereof, both publicly and privately. That possibly also he had heard of some mislikings of the said propositions by some in authority. [Perhaps, says Strype, he meant the Lord Treasurer]. But that therein peradventure in the end he might deceive himself. 2

For this reason, Whitgift tells Goad, they [the authorities at Cambridge] must proceed cautiously against him, and not begin any prosecution without consulting with him.

However, during the first months of the proceedings against Barrett, Baro remains quiet as far as public dispu-

---

1 Whitgift, II, 275.
2 Ibid., 296.

tation is concerned. He does defend the doctrinal issue that Barrett has raised, in a private meeting of the Consistory. Strype says, after describing the two sermons of Dr. Some which stirred up the muddied waters at a time during the quarrel when Whitgift had thought he had them stilled, and Whitgift's letter to the Heads about it:

> This springs from the former doctrines of Baret: one whereof was, of the indefectibility of faith. Wherein, it seems, Dr Some had jarred with Dr Baro: who was with the Heads in the Consistory: and being requested by the Vice-Chancellor to deliver his opinion of these matters now in question, (perhaps to ensnare him,) after he had signified some just causes of his grief,...and how he desired this heretofore; it was thought good to the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads first to handle the question of faith, whether it may be lost penitus; Dr Baro agreed unto the same; and offered to confute, by writing, Master Dr Some's printed position of this matter. But that would not be granted him, but to set down only his opinion of that matter. For Dr Some and some others thought the former request not reasonable: and so the matter rested. 1

It is clear from this, of course, that Baro is the object more than Barrett. But on the issues for which Barrett is principally attacked Baro remains silent.[2] The Lambeth Articles are proposed, discussed, and adopted as a result only of the case of Barrett. It is only their application as a means of dogmatic discipline which later in-

---

[1] Ibid., 255.

[2] Appendix XII in Brooke Foss Westcott's A General View of the History of the English Bible, (London, 1905, 3d edition) quotes from the Gibson Papers, Vol 5, No. 41, in the Lambeth Palace Library, some facts about the Translators. The author lists Andrewes and Overall with their titles, and notes of them: "Neither of them appeared against Barret 1595, when all the Heads (but these 2 and Mr of Clarehall whyther Dr Bing or Smith did." The author notes later that he was at Cambridge at the time.

volves Baro. But from the terms of the proposals made by the High Calvinists it is apparent that Baro is the object from the beginning. As Thomas Baker puts it in his History of St John's College:

> ...Dr Baro's controversy came not on till after these articles were sent down, occasioned by his opposing them and preaching against them in his sermon ad clerum. For though he had been a secret abettor of Mr. Barrett, yet it was that sermon (preached after Dr Whitaker's death) that cost him so much trouble and at last obliged him to quit his post in the university. [1]

We know little enough about William Barrett before and after his embroilment in this academic trouble, but he appears to have been a vigorous, stubborn mind, with more independence than fitted well with the high officials with whom he was to deal. He apparently had some friends in fairly high station at Court. His confidence in their influence was actually his downfall, for he assumed he had won his case before it was well decided, and the lofty line he took turned Whitgift, who had more than half taken his part at the beginning, against him. We know that he matriculated as pensioner of Trinity College February 1, 1579/80, that he proceeded B.A. in 1584/5 and commenced M.A. in 1588.[2] He was subsequently elected a fellow of Caius. His sermon ad clerum took place some time in the term after Easter of 1595, (Prynne says the 29th of April), and steps were immediately taken within the University to show him the errors of his ways. When the authorities failed to convince him he was ordered to make a public retractation. He offered to do it in private, but when this was not allowed him, he apparently did read a retractation written for him, on May 10th. "But", says Strype, "he read it in such a manner as gave offense."[1] Over forty fellows, from various colleges, signed a protest against the manner of this recantation, on May 26th, urging that he be brought to book again. Barrett had meanwhile appealed to Whitgift, blaming the persecution of himself on a personal feud with Dr. Some, the Master of Peter-house. He avers there that those who persecute him are all Puritans, none of them well-versed in theology. On June 12th the Vice-Chancellor and Heads had informed Lord Burghley of their action, and he replied somewhat impatiently on June 16th that he was a busy man, and that the statutes of the University were clear, they might exclude him from the college and exile him from the University if he should refuse to recant, "or not perform in the manner that shall be prescribed unto him,"[2] The authorities had evidently hesitated to proceed after the recantation had been pronounced unsatisfactory. Perhaps they were aware of Barrett's connections in high place, and, as will appear from the terms of Whitgift's reaction, they were very probably attempting to by-pass ecclesiastical authority.

---

[1] History of the College of St John the Evangelist, ed. John E. B. Mayor, Cambridge, 1869.
[2] Athenae Cant., II, 236-237.

---

[1] Page 231. Heylyn and Prynne disagree about whether Barrett ever recanted. They are both wrong, for Heylyn says he never did, and Prynne says he made a recantation, which he ended by refusing to make: the second one that was enjoined on him. Prynne printed this first recantation at the end of his God No imposter nor deluder of 1630, entitled: "A coppie of a recantation of certain Errors, raked out of the dunghill of Poperie, and Pelagianisme, publiquely made by Maister Baret of Kayes Coledge in Cambridge the tenth of May, in this present yeere of our Lord 1595, in the Universitie Church, called St. Maries in Cambridge. Translated out of Lattine into English, Anno 37, Elizabeth." To this were annexed also the Lambeth Articles.

[2] Calendar of MSS.at Hatfield House, Historical MSS. Commission, Part V, London, 1894, p. 294.

Whitgift sent down a strong protest by Dr. Clayton, who had perhaps gone up to London to present the case to him.[1] He asserted that the Heads had arrogated to themselves power not in their statutes in proceeding thus against Barrett, since he (Whitgift) had the jurisdiction of religious matters in the University by special command of the Queen, and since, in addition, the vacancy of the bishopric of Ely made him the official visitor of the University. He also makes it clear that he considers much of Barrett's doctrine orthodox, and that he has had Saravia prepare a brief on it, which also approves the doctrinal principles contained in it.

Barrett was so encouraged by this answer that he insisted that his recantation was no recantation at all, and withdrew it. He carried his case to London in person, where he wrote a vigorous letter in his own defence. The other side had also carried the case to London, for Barrett complains about a libel that is being circulated against him in

---

[1] John Clayton was master of St. John's College (Strype says he was Master of Magdalen). Baker says of him in his History: (I, 196.) "One thing was owing to his government, that puritanism that had taken such deep root, was now in great measure rooted out of the college....His temper in this matter appeared further in the controversy and censure of Barrett and Baro, wherein he shewed himself no such favourer of the Calvinist opinions as were the rest of the heads; which procured him some respects from archbishop Whitgift, who wanted either light or zeal to keep pace and go along with the rigors of the zealous heads of those times, and was forced to make use of Dr Clayton to qualify and abate their heat."

London. I shall comment below on the revelations of doctrine which this reveals. It will suffice here to note that Barrett had friends in London powerful enough to suppress this libel, for a time at least. He says, as Strype delivers it:

> This libel, as he proceeded to relate to the Archbishop, had been given abroad in London by some of the said college [St John's] Therein the libellers, he said, did inveigh in some articles against the truth; in some others, most falsely against him, that the dispenser of this copy was one Munsey, of that college, whom (as he thought) they made their instrument. He had left it in a stationer's shop in St Paul's Churchyard: and by one that befriended him, [i.e. Barrett], it was suppressed for the time. But that the occasion of all this (as he supposed) was the abovesaid Dr Some: unto whom, being deputy for Mr Vice-Chancellor, he had complained of this kind of inveighing, and of others also, using the like liberty against him in St Mary's pulpit. To whom he answered, That he had countenanced and would countenance all those that would appear against him [Barrett], to the uttermost of his power. 1

The Heads' reply to Whitgift's letter was diplomatic, but they firmly informed him that they had gone over his head. Clayton wrote the same day, July 7, and reported their attitude more fully. The Heads ended their letter to Whitgift by saying:

> ...that according to their honorable Chancellor's allowance of what was done, and direction and reference to their statutes, he [Barrett] might (with his Lordship's good favour) be further there proceeded against, as the nature and quality of his fault required. 2

Clayton reported that they were determined to go their own

---

1 Strype, Whitgift, II, 237-238.
2 Page 245.

way and "be their own judges immediately under her Majesty; and in no case acknowledge any authority his Grace...had any way in these causes over them: either to determine what the doctrine was of the Church of England, or otherwise howsoever." Here we have an intimation both of what the High Calvinists thought was the doctrinal position of Whitgift, and also what they were expecting to gain by this whole matter. The issues went beyond the figure of Barrett. They thought that their chances of redefining the doctrine of the Church would be better if they could appeal to the Court where they had a powerful clique also on their side.

So, although the jurisdictional dispute now takes precedence, the doctrinal is just below the surface. The strategy of the High Calvinists, although defeated in their first purpose, eventually works somewhat to their advantage. They draw Whitgift into a showdown on jurisdiction, and then are able to elicit from him a doctrinal statement, in which he feels he must support them to hold the united front he has managed in discipline. Whitaker swings the balance of power, along with the other High Calvinists who are loyal to the Church. There is no doubt that Whitgift is aware that if the Church does not conciliate these men in matters of doctrine, they will conclude that the Puritans are right in saying that the Episcopal discipline must eventually corrupt the Church. It is ironic that the Court, to which this party had looked for the fullest support is the element which keeps these Articles from being effective in the way they had wanted them to be. Whitgift's own recital of the order of events is illuminating, although he evidences some attempt at face-saving. He does not indicate, that is, the extent to which he approved of Barrett's doctrinal statements at the beginning, and the extent to which the Articles to which he finally assented represented a retreat from the principles on which he had backed Barrett at the beginning. He was willing, in other words, to make concessions in doctrine to retain discipline. This is Whitgift's summary of the events:

A BRIEF TOUCHING MR BARRETT

1. Barret preached a sermon in Cambridge ad clerum; wherein divers unsound points of divinity were uttered to the offense of many.
2. Barret therefore was convented before the vice-chancellor and heads, and enjoined to recant.
3. Barret did read a recantation prescribed unto him, but not in such sort as satisfied most of the hearers.
4. Barrett thereupon was convented again, and threatened to be expelled the university.
5. Barrett hereupon complaineth to me; and I writ down to the vice-chancellor &c., to desire them to stay further proceeding against him, until such time as I might understand the causes of their proceeding, being matters of divinity; and the rather because I found some error in that recantation, which they had caused him to pronounce, which error also was afterwards confessed by some of them, and is manifest.
6. Hereupon they writ to my lord treasurer their chancellor, and complained grievously of Barrett, and desired that by his authority they might proceed to the punishing of Barrett.
7. My lord answered that he could confer with me, and refer the matter to my hearing.
8. But, that being misliked by the party that was sent about that business, as being supposed to be repugnant to their privileges, it pleased his lordship to write his letters to the vice-chancellor and others to proceed against Barret.
9. Which when I understood I writ to his lordship, and desired him to cause stay to be made from further proceeding in this cause, until better consideration were had thereof, some of the things called in question being deep points of divinity, and wherein great learned men did vary in opinion.
10. His lordship accordingly did cause stay to be made.
11. Then I desired of the vice-chancellor that some might be sent unto me instructed in these causes, and Barret

might come up likewise, to the end I might the better understand the controversies. All which was performed.

12. The dean of Ely [Dr Humphrey Tyndall] and Dr Whitaker came unto me; and so did Barrett.
13. I found that Barrett had erred in divers points. I delivered mine opinions of the propositions brought unto me by Dr Whitaker; wherein some few being added I agreed fully with them and they with me. And I know them to be sound doctrine, and uniformly professed in this church of England, and agreeable to the Articles of Religion established by authority. And therefore I thought it meet that Barrett should in more humble sort confess his ignorance and errors, and that none should be suffered to teach any contrary doctrine to the foresaid propositions agreed upon.

And this is the sum of all this action.

And if this agreement be not maintained further contentions will grow, to the animating of the common adversary the papist, by whose practice Barrett and others are set on, some of his opinions being indeed popish. [1]

Whitgift's second letter to the Heads is more gentle than one might expect. He probably was aware that they had appealed to Burghley. He begs them not to put him "to the trial of my authority".[2] He insists on keeping the question on an administrative basis. He says:

> I am not so light of credit as to believe Mr Baret in his own cause. And you do me wrong so to charge me. Your own proceedings and doings have drawn me into this dislike, wherein I am not as yet by your letters satisfied. Baret is a man scarce known to me. His manner of dealing, and giving occasion of these questions, I do utterly condemn: and if I had had in time knowledge therof, I would have joined with you in punishing of him to the uttermost in such sort as the quality of the offence requireth. As I will likewise in punishing of any other that shall continue these controversies, either on the one side or on the other: which I would have made known unto them, and do by all the authority I have, or credit with you, require: and pray you to take care that hereafter the pulpit, or any other public places, be used in these controversies; until such time as you shall

---

[1] The Works of John Whitgift, ed. John Ayre, I, 614-615.

[2] Strype, Whitgift, II, 252.

> receive some resolutions from hence in these causes: which had been ere this, if your hasty proceedings had not ministered occasion to the contrary....

He is now seemingly giving up the letter of his doctrine to preserve discipline. But in the most important part of his duty as primate, the recovery of the power and possessions of the Church, this must have seemed a small sacrifice. He knew that there was a group of courtiers who sympathized with the Puritans, and he knew also that they did so more through hope of the further gain they could get from further expropriations than from any real doctrinal sympathy. He was in constant battle with them,[1] and any deep split in the Church would play into their hands and weaken it. He is also, I think, trying to keep the affair on the administrative level as a means of protecting Baro and the liberal party in the University. His anger later at Baro is motivated by the fact that Baro was too conscientious to accept the compromise that Whitgift had worked out. For Whitgift it is far more important that the Church present a united front to its enemies at Court, than that the individual conscience of any theologian be protected.

The clash between Baro and Some,[2] which I mentioned above, seems to have taken place at the first meeting of the Consistory where Barrett was arraigned. Some now complicated the matter by delivering two angry and denunciatory sermons. After the first of these, he was summoned to London, where Whitgift "gently reproved him", as Strype puts it. He, however, returned to Cambridge and gave vent to his personal animosity in another, even more violent sermon, which prompted Whitgift in this second letter to inform the Heads that such action was going too far.

---

[1] Walton's Life of Hooker relates the long lecture which Whitgift gave Elizabeth on her duty to the Church, after one such quarrel over Church prerogatives with Leicester. (World's Classics edition, pp. 191 ff.)

[2] Robert Some (or Soame) will appear later in these proceedings, and in the quarrels in which Overall figured more prominently in 1599 and 1600. He was at this time Master of Peterhouse; in 1600 he was Vice-Chancellor of the University.

This letter of Whitgift's also included a rebuke to the High Calvinist party for having presumed "to judge what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Church of England; what not." He also promises to send down some "resolutions" for pacifying "these disputes and controversies." I think the probability is, however, that here he is referring to administrative regulations, not doctrinal statements. He ends by saying that the law expressly lays the making of such rules "upon her Majesty, and upon such as she shall by commission appoint to that purpose. And how far my authority under her Highness reacheth therein, I hope you will not give me occasion to try."

Ironically enough, they were to give Whitgift occasion to try how far his authority would reach in this matter, and they were to find that it did not reach far enough for them.

The Heads' answer to this letter retreats somewhat from their former position, but not fully, for they were still to try going over Whitgift's head to Burghley. Dr Some carried a message to Burghley "importing that Barret's cause was not to be withdrawn from them; and insisting upon their privileges, as their statutes, as they pretended, bore them out."[1]

---

[1] Strype, II, 258.

They had also enlisted Whitaker in the matter, and he now wrote a letter to Whitgift[1] in mollifying terms, stating the case of the Heads more diplomatically, and giving more attention to the doctrinal issue.[2]

Burghley, was more cautious now than he had been. He sent the messenger and the letter to Whitgift. The latter's reply reviews the case and his own actions to date, reminding Burghley, diplomatically, that it was he who had put the Heads up to this by telling them to go ahead with their proceedings against Barrett, even though "...some of the points wherewith they had charged him [Barrett], and which they had caused him to recant, without either his Lordship's knowledge or his, [Whitgift's] were such as the best learned Protestants, then living, varied in judgment upón."[1] He urges Burghley to write to Cambridge and bid them to "forebear any further dealing in these causes until his Lordship were further informed therein; and until the state of the controversy were made better known unto him", assuring him that otherwise there would only be more controversy.

---

[1] Strype prints this letter in his Appendix to the Whitgift, No. xxv, pp. 337-339.

[2] Hardwick represents it that "Whitaker...had been now induced to mediate between the three contending parties." It is evident from here on that Whitaker has great prestige with Whitgift, but it is only circumstantial evidence to say that he was mediating. It is just as accurate to say that the High Calvinists had enlisted him in some way on their side, and that Whitgift was led to modify his stand by the high-handedness of Barrett as well as the danger he saw of the administrative split becoming doctrinal, a danger which he was well aware would be fatal. But Hardwick's comment is illuminating, none the less: He says: "The great service rendered by him [Whitaker] to the Church in answering the objections of Cardinal Bellarmine, placed him high in the opinion of Archbishop Whitgift, while the moderate and conciliatory tone which he adopted at this stage of the dispute, contributed still more to the promotion of his general object. He no longer ventured to assert that the opinions of Barrett flatly contradicted the language of the Articles; he even went so far as to concede that many of the controverted points 'were not concluded and defined by public authority'; yet, pleading that the Church had been most violently disturbed, and that opinions of his adversary were both novel and offensive, he requested the Archbishop to employ his influence in exacting from the culprit a more ample recantation." (A History of the Articles of Religion, p. 173).

Since they had failed to go over Whitgift's head, the Heads came around in September to a more amenable frame of mind. Whitgift had also made a concession by consenting to call Barrett further to account before him. The Heads petition the Archbishop in form that measures be taken to silence these quarrels, by implication granting him the authority to do so and relinquishing their own claims, which they had so stoutly advanced. Barrett was forced to answer some questions which, Strype says,

> ...were nicely propounded, and suited critically to the principles of Whitaker and the rest of the Heads, in those points of doctrine. So that if Barret came not up in his answers to them, he lay at their mercy, without the especial favour of the Archbishop interposed on his behalf. 2

Barrett's answers to the eight questions were sent to Whitgift with a statement of his submission to the Archbishop in which he promised to 'yield' himself 'compliant and obedient' in whatever decision should be reached. Whitaker answered these statements of Barrett's seriatim in another sermon ad clerum, and, in a long opinion addressed to Whitgift, asserted that on the whole Barrett's answers were still un-

---

1 Strype, Whitgift, II, 258.
2 Ibid., 263.

satisfactory. In his answer, Whitgift seems to be delivering his quid pro quo for the Heads' submission, for he agrees on most of the points with Whitaker.

In October, Barrett went up to London again, with Whitaker and Tyndal, where he was examined before the Archbishop upon the questions Whitaker had set him. The decision that resulted was that Barrett should make another recantation "...to be drawn up by the Vice-Chancellor, and in his [Barrett's] own words, out of his own dictates, according to his own request, when he was with his Grace...."[1] But, after asking for a respite and being granted until the end of January, and after conferring with Chaderton and Overall, Barrett finally refused to make his recantation. As I have noted above, it was said that his decision was made on the basis of the sermon preached at just that time by Baro.

While Barrett was thus debating with himself, Whitaker and Tyndal again went up to London as deputies of the Heads to consult with Whitgift "...for the pacification of these disputes and differences; and...for establishing a peaceable order."[2] Whitaker addressed a letter to Burghley from the house of his uncle, Nowell the dean of St. Paul's, on November 19, enclosing a sermon he had preached just before leaving:

> ...wherin I was by dutie moved to entreat of certaine points of religion, which some amongst us have begunne of late to call into question, and soe have bredd some difference of judgments in the minds of manie; and greater offense and

---

[1] Ibid., 274.
[2] Ibid., 279.

> trouble is to be feared, if good order be not taken and provided to the contrarie in tyme. I laboured herin by setting downe such grounds as I have received of the best writers, to stay the mynds of our scholars, and to maintaine the doctrine of our churche to my simple power against theis innovations. I take not upon me to enforme your lordships judgement; onlie I thought it my dutie to acquaint you with our troubles, and theis controversies raised in your Universitie, wherof I desire and beseache almightie Godd to see a good and quiet end. And for that purpose am I now sent hether from the Universitie to labour with the chiefe governors of ecclesiasticall causes under hir majestie, for establishing a peaceable order; wherin what successe Godd doth give unto our labours I will certifie your lordship ere it be long. 1

Without stopping for breath he asks to "recommend the consideration of my poor estate to your honor", pointing out that he has been a reader of divinity for 16 years and is yet unprovided with any reward, which he now begs he may be granted, complaining that he has always been "forgotten in the great preferments of soe many."

There seems to be no doubt in his mind that the Articles they are about to agree upon will be received by the Court as law. He was to find himself mistaken.

It was from this conference of Whitaker, Tyndal, and others with Whitgift that the Lambeth Articles resulted. Before I discuss their content and import, however, Barrett's fate must be reported, and a summary made of the points of doctrine which had so far been involved. Strype says only:

> At length the Heads made a conclusion with Baret, according to the advice the Archbishop had given them by Dr Clayton: which it seemed they followed.

---

1 Heywood and Wright, II, 62-63.

> And in a letter he wrote them in the month of January, he told them he liked well of what they had done. 1

Prynne and Heylyn, as I have noted, disagree about whether this second recantation of Barrett's ever took place. There seems to be no doubt that it did not. Heylyn says that no record of such a recantation was found when Parliament asked the Heads in 1628 to "...make certificate to them of all such Recantations in their University Register...and of this Recantation in particular." "And, [he continues] though it be hereupon inferred, that this Recantation was imbezilled and razed out of the Records of the University by some of the Arminian party, the better to suppress the memory of so great a soil; yet it may rather be believed, that many false copies of it were dispersed abroad by those of the Calvinian faction to make the man more odious, and his Opinions more odious than might stand with Truth."[2]

Heylyn apparently is resting his assertion on a careless reading of the letter the Heads wrote to Burghley complaining about Baro, on March 8, 1595/6. They there say that Barrett has refused to retract "in such sort, as hath been prescribed him."[3] This means, as we have seen, that he had read a recantation which had not been accepted, but it also means that he had not yet recanted any further, and since he had been given only until the end of January, we may assume that the recantation was never made.[4]

---

[1] Strype, Whitgift, II, 277.

[2] Quinquart. Hist., ch. xx.

[3] Strype, Annals, IV, 320 ff.

[4] Heylyn prints a letter from Barrett to Goad saying that

On March 30, 1597 Whitgift and other commissioners for causes ecclesiastical addressed a letter to the Vice-chancellor, stating that Barrett intended to depart the realm. The Vice-chancellor was requested to take security that he should not do it without the Queen's permission, and was asked to put him in prison if they could not get from him such security.[1] But the warning evidently arrived too late, for, as Fuller says,

> Yea, soon after he departed the University, got beyond sea, turned a papist, returned into England, where he led a layman's life until the day of his death. 2

There is no reason to doubt the truth of this statement. Barrett had reported to Whitgift early in the dispute, that:

> ...whereas this year was the time of his commencement, and these acts he had done for his degree, he referred himself unto his Grace's direction; whether he thought it convenient he should proceed this year or no. Lastly, whereas he was advertised by one of the chief of the University, that these Doctors, his adversaries in this cause,

---

he has conferred with Overall and Chaderton. But, he says, "Mr Overald after one conference, refused to talk of these points any more, saying it needed not: For Mr Chadderton he is a learned man, and one whom I do much reverence, yet he hath not satisfied me in this point." He asserts that therefore he proposes not to perform this Retractation; he promises, however, to keep his opinion to himself for the sake of the peace of the University.

[1] Athenae Cant.

[2] History of Cambridge, p. 209. It is apparent from comparing the two, that Fuller is here echoing closely the phrases of Prynne in his Anti-Arminianisme (1630). Prynne has: "Not long after this Palinodie, Master Barret, (to shew that these positions are but a bridge to Popery) departs the University, and gets beyond Sea; where he (as Bertius and some other Arminians since have done) turnes a professed Papist: After this he returned into England, where he lives a layman's life, being still an open, dangerous, violent, and most pernicious seducing Papist, as some men of credit in these very termes have informed me, who both know, and will averre him to be such a one." (page 61).

> purposed to remove him out of the University by some means or other, which if they could accomplish, they cared not if it were by some inconvenience to themselves....[1]

Since he had not made his recantation, it is certain that he was not awarded his degree. From Overall's reaction it seems that the Arminian party had decided that he was more of a handicap than a help to them and had determined to allow him to be jettisoned.

The Dictionary of National Biography says that "Barrett is by some identified with the publisher, who prefixed a letter to his own edition of Robert Southwell's works, entitled St Peter's complaints, Mary Magdalene's Teares, with other works of the author, R. S., London, 1620 and 1630. The Short Title Catalogue also lists a work entered in 1612 by a William Barrett. But for our purposes he now drops completely from sight.

Barrett's doctrines as he expressed them in his first sermon, however, contain some valuable points which explain the position of Baro and the others of the party at that time. His own summary of it, in being called before the Heads for the first time, was this:

> 1. Neminem in hoc fragili mundo tanta firmitate esse suffultum, saltem certitudine fidei, i.e. nisi per revelationem, ut de salute sua debeat esse securus.
>
> 2. Petri fidem deficere non potuisse: at aliorum posse. Nam pro fide singulorum non oravit Dominus.
>
> 3. Quoad finalem perseverantiam, superbam esse illam securitatem de futuro; eoque natura sua contingenti.

---

[1] Strype, Whitgift, II, 244.

> Cujus generis est uniuscujusque hominis perseverantia: neque tantum superbam, sed impiissimam.
>
> 4. In fide nullam esse distinctionem, sed in credentibus.
>
> 5. Remissionem peccatorum esse articulum fidei, sed non specialem, nec hujus, nec illius. Nec posse nec debere quenquam vere fidelem certo credere peccata sua esse sibi remissa.
>
> 6. Quod ad eos attinet, qui non servantur, peccatum esse veram, propriam, et primam causam reprobationis. [1]

"Which last", adds Strype, "he said, he most firmly believed, and ingenuously confessed he believed against Calvin, Peter Martyr, and the rest." He summarized it again in the retractation that he failed to deliver:

> For I said confidently, and stiffly maintained, first That a temporary and unfruitful faith is all one with a true and saving faith; and that there is no difference or distinction in faith. Secondly, That it is given to none certainly to know by a certainty of faith that he is elected. Thirdly, That none can in this frail world be certain of his salvation by a certainty of faith. Fourthly, That remission of sins is an article of faith, but not special of this or that person. Fifthly, That Peter's faith only could not fail. Sixthly, That Christ prayed for Peter's faith only, that it should not fail. Seventhly, That David knew not that he could not fall away. Eighthly, That the gift of perseverance is a future contingent. [2]

A major point of the indictment of Barrett was that he had also 'railed against' Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, and the rest of the Calvinistic hierarchy. The Heads in their letter of June 12th enclosed, with a copy of the sermon which had been supplied them by Barrett, the "bitter and distasteful speeches which he had used against the learned writers of our age."

---

[1] Ibid., p. 229.
[2] Ibid., p. 274.

Their table of particulars included his

> ...impudent challenging of Calvin, Beza, P. Martyr, Zanchy, and others, of errors in doctrines of faith, in most bitter terms; whom they [the Heads] never knew in our Church heretofore to be touched in that matter: and taking upon him to answer those places which were alleged of Protestants for the certainty of faith; and allegeing those places and speeches which were used in the Tridentine Council and Popish writers, to prove Popish doubtfulness; and that we cannot assure ourselves of salvation. 1

They cite also his "familiarity and conversation with recusants and Papists", but since we do not hear of anything of this sort from any other source, and the matter is not pressed against him later, we may discount it.

It is clear throughout this period that Barrett is in a way being made an example for the purpose of opposing the reaction from Calvinism, the Calvinist theologians, and the new scholasticism in general. Hooker's more temperate challenge of the authority of Calvin had led off his four books of the Ecclesiasticall Polity two years before. The Heads in their letter about Barrett say:

> For that things were already grown to that pass, ...that in these times, instead of godly and sound writers among their stationers, the new writers were very rarely bought: and that there were no books more ordinarilie bought and sold, than Popish writers: Jesuits, Friars, Postil-writers, Stapleton, and such like, being the books that were then best uttered.
>
> That upon the search that had been made by his Grace's appointment, many Divines' studies being searched, there were found, in divers studies, many Friars, Schoolmen's, and Jesuits' writings; and of Protestants, either few or none. What might come of this, they referred to his Grace's wisdom to consider. 2

---

1 Ibid., pp. 233-234.
2 Ibid., pp. 234-235.

Barrett, in his letter defending himself to Whitgift, claimed he had only said that Calvin was rash and impious in saying that Christ almost despaired of his salvation. He insisted also that he had never denied the certainty of salvation, that he had only said that one ought not to be secure. In this his doctrine had the approbation of Saravia, who wrote an opinion for Whitgift when the quarrel first broke out, and of Lancelot Andrewes, whose Censura Censurae D. Barreti[1] centers on this point, and cites a long list of authorities in favor of Barrett's view.

Barrett himself is not above widening the area of controversy to an issue which had also come into Baro's Praelectiones: the doctrine of Christ's descent into Hell. This was a pressing problem for the whole sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and its solution represents one of the first triumphs of historical scholarship. Calvin made it merely a symbolic statement of Christ's suffering on the Cross,[2] and the Puritans cling to that, although it made the Creed repetitious. Professor Knappen points out that the split on the interpretation of this doctrine "...is a further sign of the beginnings of theological differences between the two great parties of English Protestants." It is, however, as I think I have shown, an essentially minor one. Whitgift himself had been convinced that the view he had held was wrong, by Hugh Broughton, the testy orientalist, who argued that the word Hell in the creed could be the word Gehenna, meaning merely 'place of the dead' rather than the 'abode of the damned' and thus could include Paradise. The year before, Whitgift had sent out a summons to Broughton to come to Lambeth to explain his doctrine. Broughton had incontinently fled to Leyden, declaring that he was in fear of his life, a reaction which confused Whitgift. The Archbishop said he had meant it in good part, "...it was only to answer Dr Andrews about the descent into hell."[1] It is evident that Andrewes shared Baro's conclusion in the Praelectiones, that Christ actually did descend into Hell, for the purpose of the Harrowing of Hell, to carry his conquest to the very center of the principle of evil. As Baro says: "mortem in suo regno vicit ac debellavit, ut in aeternum postea in Superis, ad Dextram Patris collocatus, vivat."[2] However, he lists six ways in which the statement may be taken, one of which is that Hell may be only Gehenna, and he claims that they all may be true.[3] Osmund Lake, however, hesitated to publish this doctrine without support, "lest," he says, "this opinion displease some because of its novelty." So he inserted a long passage from a book by one Gaspar Olevianus Trevir, minister of the church at Heidelberg, supporting the same view.

---

[1] Printed in Minor Works of Bishop Andrewes, Oxford, 1846, pp. 301-305.

[2] Institutes, ii, 16. See Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, pp. 370-371. In 1600 Overall likewise will be accused of teaching that Christ suffered the pains of Hell.

Barrett, however, continues his defence:

---

[1] Strype, Whitgift, II, 221.
[2] Praelectiones, p. 166.
[3] "Hi autem omnes sensus in se veri sunt, nec ullus est qui a fide Analogia discrepat. Ferendi autem videntur omnes, quorum sensus est verus, praecipue pacis in Ecclesia conservandae causa. Sunt & alii quidam sensus sed a veritate abhorrentes." (p. 154.)

> But see, if it please you, how unjust they are against me, beyond all manner and measure: here is amongst us an obscure fellow [homuncio quidam] whose name is Perkins; who hath written a book in English, Of the Apostles' Creed: in which book he denieth a certain article of faith, namely, the descent into hell. Which article nevertheless is publicly and most firmly believed and confessed by the Church, and by the faithful in the Church. This tract is brought by the printer to the Vice-Chancellor, and the rest of the examiners. It displeaseth them not. The ill book is approved; cometh abroad; and now is sold at London. All is well. Now what will become of me? I have laid down nothing against the doctrine of the Church, as he hath. And this, whatever it be that I have laid down, yet I have not exposed it in English. Should I not therefore be let alone, as well as he? No, by no means. For they do not only not approve of me and my opinion, but presently condemn me. 1

There may be a hint here of the reason why the Arminians' defence of Barrett was not more rigorous. He wants to narrow the orthodox doctrine of the Church to his own interpretation as much as the High Calvinists do, while, as Baro's admission of six possible interpretations of the doctrine shows, the real Arminian impulse is to make the fundamentals of faith consist in a few principles, and allow a considerable latitude on the others. This is the center of Hooker's Polity, and becomes the policy of the Latitudinarians as well as of the Anglicans generally.

---

1 Strype, Whitgift, II, 237. Baro was later to complain in similar terms of the protection rendered Perkins. It is also notable that whereas the Praelectiones was a folio, beautifully finished, and "Cum gratia & Privilegio", Baro's subsequent works were much more modestly presented. It seems that the High Calvinists were moving in on the press also. Under Laud they are to complain that only Arminian books are allowed to be published, but, as I shall show in Chapter VI, Overall felt he must send Thomson's book to Holland to be printed, when Abbott was Archbishop.

The 'libell' which Barrett complains has been printed in London 'by some of St John's College' is reprinted by Strype, apparently from the very copy sent to Whitgift by Barrett with the latter's marginal comments in reply to the charges. It contains nine points:

> I. A Man may fal out of the favour of God, and in again; yea, quite out of the state of grace, being in.
> II. A man may utterly and finally loose justifying faith.
> [To which Barrett comments: "I have not once named Justifying faith in al my sermon."]
> III. A man cannot be sure of his salvation in this world: yea, it is high presumption to think he may be.
> [Barrett: "I spake of the ordinary certainty, whereby a man ought not to be secure; and of none other, as it appears in my sermon."] [1]
> IV. Remission of sin in the Creed is general, not particular.
> V. If S. Paul was sure of his salvation, it was by revelation.
> [Barrett: "I said not so; but only, that S. Paul had a revelation."]
> VI. Sin was the true, proper, and highest cause of reprobation.
> ["I did not say it was the highest, but only the first moving cause."]
> VII. Beza blasphemed, who said, Donum fidei a dono perseverantiae separari non potest.
> ["I said not so, but that it was inconsiderate dictum."]
> VIII. Calvin blasphemed most horribly who said, Christ in his agony almost despaired of his salvation; and yet a man should not.
> ["I said, he blasphemed in saying, Our Saviour almost despaired; and yet we ought not once to fear."]

---

[1] Andrewes in his Censura says (p. 305.): "Fideles de praedestinatione perseverantiaque sua incertos esse per omnem vitam, probat Augustinus." Hooker was attacked by Travers for the same implication. He says in his Answer to Travers' Supplication (III, 718.): "...the strongest in faith that liveth upon the earth, hath always need to labour, and strive, and pray, that his assurance concerning heavenly and spiritual things may grow, increase, and be augmented."

> IX. Calvin Beza, Luther, P. Martyr, and Junius, were false guides. And he mervailed that we taught not so; and bewailed the iniquity of our time, that we should be so misled by such young teachers. ["If I said any such thing, I submit my self willingly to any punishment that your Grace shal think meet to inflict upon me. But in truth, I said not one word to that purpose."] 1

Whitgift, in his first letter to the Heads, as I have noted, revealed that he"...was of his (Barrett's) mind in some points." He first of all repudiates the claim of the Heads that books by Papists were forbidden, simply because they were by Papists. They are only forbidden, if they contain "matter against this State". He condemns their hasty proceedings against Barrett, cites his powers of visitation, and claims that they have "proceeded in matters wherein they had no authority."

> For that in some points of his retractation, they had made him to affirm that which was contrary to the doctrine holden and expressed by many sound and learned Divines in the Church of England, and in other churches likewise, men of best account: and that which, for his own part, he [Whitgift] thought to be false and contrary to the Scriptures. For the Scriptures were plain, that God by his absolute will did not hate and reject any man, without an eye to his sin. There might be impiety in believing the one; there could be none in believing the other. Neither was it contrary to any article of religion, established by authority in this Church of England; but rather agreeable thereunto....
> 'Neminem debere esse securum de salute' to what article of religion established in this Church it was contrary, he saw not...
> 'Credentium fides, or electorum fides, potest deficere totaliter sed non finaliter', That it was a matter disputable, and wherein learned men did and might dissent without impiety.

He admitted that 'In fide nullam esse distinctionem, sed in credentibus' was an error, "but yet without the compass of

---

1 Strype, Whitgift, III, Appendix, 320, No. xxii.

their authority; having no article directly against it: and an error of that nature that might be solved by distinction, worthy of reprehension, not of recantation, for any thing he could yet understand." He could not approve Barrett's ideas on remission of sins, for he had only showed his ignorance in that. He should have been "better instructed". He also knew no article against reproving Calvin "for his bad and unchristian censure of King Henry VIII, or him and others, in that peremptory and false reproof of this Church of England," although to traduce them in pulpits he could not approve.

The opinion rendered by Saravia was followed closely by Whitgift in this statement. Saravia concluded that Barrett was right in saying that sin was the true, proper, and first cause of reprobation as well as in denying that anyone should feel securus, for there was, he said, a great difference between certitudinem and securitatem. He was also right, said Saravia, in saying that there was no difference in faith, if he meant to say that the temporary faith of some 'did nothing differ' from justifying faith. Not all that truly believe, however, he said, are elect. "The faith of some that truly believe may fail, but not of such as are elect."[1]

The Heads, in rejecting Whitgift's power in the case, cited their side of the doctrinal issue in six points, the most important of which were the third and the sixth. In the third they aver:

---

[1] Ibid., No. xxiv, pp. 321-337. Saravia was a close friend of Hooker, and Walton claims that he was the largest influence on the writing of the Polity. However it is certain that Hooker did not share the full measure of Saravia's views on the divine right of Bishops, to associate Hooker with which is, I think, the main reason Walton so dwells on their intimacy. Nevertheless it is true that their agreement was close in these doctrinal questions. Saravia

> That true justifying faith, whereby we are ingrafted into Christ, is so fixed, and certain to continue, that it never can be utterly lost or extinguished in them which have the true justifying faith.

In the sixth:

> That in the execution of God's decree there is always respect to sin; and the cause of damnation is in the wicked themselves. But in predestination itself, there is no respect or cause either of holiness in the elect, or of sin in the reprobate; but it dependeth wholly on the mere will and good pleasure of God. 1

Whitaker, in entering the issue, was willing to take a more moderate line as far as the sanctions of orthodoxy were concerned. His phrasing of the questions put to Barrett are designed to reveal the weaknesses, in Calvinistic terms, of Whitgift's position, as well as Barrett's. He admits that

> Of predestination and reprobation, it is our part to speak advisedly. But that the only will of God is cause of reprobation, being taken, as it is, contrary to predestination, not only S. Paul and S. Augustine, but the best and learnedest Schoolmen, have largely and invincibly proved. 2

---

was born in Flanders and came to England after serving pastorates in Flanders notably at Ghent. (Keble, I, 74 n.) He came to England first some time in the seventies (Keble, I, lxvi.), then returned to the Low Countries to teach at Leyden. He remained there some ten years, until Leicester was recalled in 1587. He had worked out for himself a theory of the divine right of bishops which he proceeded to publish about 1590, after being recalled to England to fill a position as prebend of Canterbury. Keble notes that with him and with Bancroft begins the doctrine of Episcopal divine right in England. He was one of the translators of the King James Bible, on the committee at Westminster that included Andrewes and Overall. He died January 15, 1612/13, aged 82.

[1] Whitgift, p. 249.

[2] Appendix No, xxv, p. 339.

But he manages to drive Barrett into admissions such as that in his answer to the fourth question, that the Church had the power of Indulgence and that the sins of any man, however grievous, might be remitted by the Church. This was beyond the power of Whitgift to admit at this point, although Hooker was to defend the Church's power of Indulgence in the Fifth Book of the Polity, two years later. But in the setting Whitaker gave it, this was Popish doctrine.

Whitgift, then, retreats, and joins in urging another recantation on Barrett. But when Whitaker comes to London with a draft of the Articles by which conformity and orthodoxy will be enforced hereafter, Whitgift and the other Bishops succeed in modifying them considerably. I shall not attempt to repeat what has already been done by Miss Thompson in the article to which I have referred earlier; give in detail the changes that were introduced, and the extent to which the final version is below the extreme of High Calvinist orthodoxy, but I think I have already shown that her claim that Whitgift was more liberal in doctrine than he has been given credit for being, is reasonable, in view of the position he took in the beginning of the Barrett affair.

This clash between the two parties, then, shows the Arminians stronger than has been generally recognized. They have chosen and will choose the grounds on which they will stand in the years to come, and the issues which will be their basis of defence; they are doctrinal as well as disciplinarian. Their strength has drawn offensive moves from the High Calvinists and the beginnings of the split on doctrine are now in evidence. The Lambeth Articles heal the breach to some extent, although they are immediately used by the High Calvinists to attack the Arminians further. It is significant, however, that the ultimate purposes of these Articles are defeated by the Court.

It is clear that the idea of the Articles as such is Whitgift's from the beginning, to substitute something written for the interpretations of the Heads, a principle which had so far made all the trouble. On July 11, he had written to the Heads not to allow any preaching on the controverted topics "until you receive some resolutions from hence." He repeats this on September 30th. In his own summary of the happenings, which I have reproduced above, Whitgift has telescoped the two meetings, but it is clear that the summons was his, that Whitaker brought a set of suggested articles, and that Whitgift added to them. He implies, however, that there were no changes made in the articles as submitted by Whitaker. Hardwick suggests that the Calvinists held a series of meetings to polish the propositions they were to deliver to Whitgift. Heylyn and Collier say that the work was finished on the tenth of November, while Strype gives the date as the 20th. Probably the first draft was submitted to Whitgift on the tenth, and the final version was finished on the latter date.[1] At any rate,

---

[1] Miss Thompson notes that the letter in which Hutton, Archbishop of York, who was consulted on the Articles, comments on them is dated October, when supposedly the Articles had not yet been drawn up. And she also notes that he comments on the amended version of the Articles. She has no explanation. It may lie in a simple mistake of Hutton's in dating his letter.

Miss Thompson's point is well taken, that the final version differs greatly from that suggested by the High Calvinists.

Before I go on to more specific notice of this point, I may add a piece of evidence about the attendance at the meeting which drew up the articles. Miss Thompson states correctly that nowhere is there given a full list of those responsible for the Articles. Strype names only Whitgift, Whitaker, and Tyndal, and in the heading of the Articles as he reproduces them there is the name of Richard Fletcher, who was at the time Bishop-elect of London. Heylyn adds the name of Richard Vaughan, who was Bishop-designate of Bangor, and he also refers to other divines from Cambridge, besides Whitaker and Tyndal. Miss Thompson hazards the guess that Andrewes was also there, as well as Saravia. We may now definitely add Andrewes to the list, for he was to tell Grotius in April, 1613 that he had been present at the conference where the Lambeth Articles were drawn up and approved. He also confirms Miss Thompson's central assumption, for he told Grotius also that Whitaker's first version had been altogether different from what had finally been decided on, and that the Articles had been drawn up as they were in a definite effort to compromise between the two parties.[1] He also told Grotius in 1613 that the minutes of that meeting were in his possession.

Miss Thompson argues for the validity and dependability of a book entitled Articuli Lambethani which appeared in

---

[1] Molhuysen, Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius, I, 231-232.

1651, containing the text of the articles suggested by Whitaker and the final text of the Articles, as well as Lancelot Andrewes' comments on the final form,[1] and Overall's doctrine of predestination. Andrewes says in his opinion that for the sixteen years he has been a priest he has not disputed about these questions publicly or privately; he thinks it more important that the people be taught to seek salvation in leading a holy life than in the secret divine counsels. But since he has been asked his opinion he will give it. He asserts that there is certainly such a thing as predestination, and reprobation too, but that reprobation is for sin; he also insists that predestination cannot be considered without adding foreknowledge to it. He insists that the elect can fall from grace, and that saving Grace, though not conferred on all, is certainly offered to all.

---

[1] The full title is: "Articuli Lambethani id est
I Articulorum Lambethae exhibitorum Historia
II Articuli de Praedestinatione, et annexis capitibus a
D. Whitakero Lambethae propositi
III Idem prout ab Episcopis Theologisque concepti et admissi
IV Lanceloti Andrewes *Tó Mávu* Wintoniensis Episcopi, de
Synodo oblatis Articulis Judicium; una cum ejusdem Censura
Censurae D. Barreti, de Certitudine salutis
Quibus annexa est
V Sententia D. Overal Theologiae in Academia Cantabrigiensi
Professoris Regii de Praedestinatione - ...

Cura et impensis F. G. Ecclesiae Sti Nicolati apud Trinobantes Ministri

Londini, Typis G. D. AN.Dom. 1651."

Miss Thompson has sought carefully for the identity of the author. The records for churches dedicated to St. Nicholas have no mention of any name corresponding to F. G., 'Trinobantes' might be anywhere in the eastern counties, she reports. The printer seems to have been William Dugard who printed Milton's *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* in the same year. The Stationers' Register records the entry of this book on 16 December, 1650, for Wm Dugard, along with "Fur pradestinatus" (*sic*) and records them as "published by John Goldman clarke." *Fur Praedestinatus* has generally been ascribed to Sancroft who was later Archbishop. Perhaps "F.G." is a misprint for J.G., but the name John Goldman gets us no farther along in the problem. At any rate, I think, Miss Thompson is justified in thinking that the early version of the Articles there is genuine. Again, Andrewes' statement to Grotius should settle the problem.

For the detailed consideration of the theological issues involved here, I may refer to Miss Thompson's article which is detailed and convincing. I shall reproduce, however, the two versions of the Articles as they were printed in Articuli Lambethani.

A. Articuli Lambethani propositi prout a cl. V. D. Whitakero in ipsius autographo concepti. Episcopis aliisque Theologis Lambethae proponebantur.

I. Deus ab aeterno praedestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit.

II. Causa efficiens Praedestinationis non est praevisio fidei aut perseverantiae, aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei quae insit personis praedestinatis. sed sola et absoluta et simplex voluntas Dei.

III. Praedestinatorum praefinitus et certus est numerus qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

IV. Qui non sunt praedestinati ad salutem, necessario propter peccata condemnabuntur.

V. Vera, viva et justificans fides et spiritus Dei sanctificans non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit, in iis qui semel ejus participes fuerunt, aut totaliter aut finaliter.

VI. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante praeditus, certus est, certitudine fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

VII. Gratia sufficiens ad salutem non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur, universis hominibus, qua servari possint si velint.

VIII. Nemo potest venire ad Christum nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit: et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre ut veniant ad filium.

IX. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis servari.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

B. Articuli Lambethani propositi prout ab Episcopo reliquisque Theologis concepti sunt, et de sensu quo admissi sunt.

I. (Remained unchanged. As Andrewes pointed out, this was a cliché; everyone knew that some were predestined and some reprobate.)

II. Causa movens aut efficiens praedestinationis ad vitam non est praevisio fidei, aut perseverantiae aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei, quae insit in personis praedestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

III. Praedestinatorum praefinitus et certus numerus est, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

IV. Qui non sunt praedestinati ad salutem necessario propter peccata sus damnabuntur.

V. Vera viva, justificans fides et Spiritus Dei sanctificans non extinguitur, non excedit in electis, aut totaliter, aut finaliter.

VI. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante praeditus, certus est plerophoria fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum, et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

VII. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si voluerint.

VIII. Nemo potest venire ad Christum nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit. Et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre, ut veniant ad Filium.

IX. (unchanged).

Whitaker had given his hand to Chaderton when he left for London, "...that he would stand to God's cause against the Lutherans..."[1] He had had to be satisfied with a consider-

---

[1] "Historical Notes from Dr Ward's MS. 'Adversaria'", in Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, ed. M.M. Knappen, p. 125. It is important to note that there is no connection of these doctrines with Arminius at this date. Ward notes under 1596 (page 126) "Lutheranism begins to be maintained." And under January 30, 1598/1599: "Think how all things tend to declination from Religion, and that there beginneth a general defection in England. How popery dayly is spread abroad, example of Williams' sermon, Day his Problem, Overall's not subscribing..." Compare these articles with Prynne's formulation of the Anti-Arminian articles, in his Anti-Arminianisme of 1629 and 1630, annexed to this chapter.

able modification of the terms which he had suggested.

I have not space here to discuss the long-term effects of these Articles. Fuller's is as good a description as any of their immediate reception, and his own attitude toward them as a historian, which inspires one of his purple passages on the technique of writing history, demonstrates what a live issue they were even in his day. The Calvinists have since pointed out that they were promulgated by the Archbishop and the leading theologians and that they were considered to be binding upon the Church. The Arminians demonstrate that they were never approved as Articles of Religion, that Elizabeth threatened Whitgift with a _praemunire_ for having them made, and there are claims that they were suppressed. Fuller is puzzled about their authority. "...how much above the results and resolutions of private divines, and how much beneath the authority of a provincial synod." But he summons up his courage as a historian, and turns it magnificently to the aid of his religious and political preferences. He says:

> And now I perceive I must tread tenderly, because I go not, as before, on men's graves, but am ready to touch the quick of some yet alive. I know how dangerous it is to follow truth too near to the heels; yet better it is that the teeth of an historian be struck out of his head for writing the truth, than that they remain still and rot in his jaws, by feeding too much on the sweet meats of flattery. All that I will say of the credit of these Articles is this: that as medals of gold and silver, though they will not pass in payment for current coin, because not stamped with the king's inscription, yet they will go with goldsmiths for as much as they are in weight; so, though these Articles want authentic reputation to pass for provincial acts, as lacking sufficient authority, yet will they be readily received of orthodox Christians for as far as their

> own purity bears conformity to God's word. And though those learned divines be not acknowledged as competent judges to pass definitive sentences in those points, yet they will be taken as witnesses beyond exception, whose testimony is an infallible evidence what was the general and received doctrines of England in that age about the forenamed controversies. 1

What Andrewes told Grotius in 1613 pretty well sums up the Arminian case against the articles. According to the custom of the country, he tells Grotius, these should be confirmed by public authority, which has not been done. The Lord Treasurer, he goes on, has also forbidden them to be printed. J. Bingham writes to Grotius in the same terms on October 25, 1615. 2

Whitgift announced the Articles in a letter to the Vice-chancellor on November 24th. He makes it clear that the purpose of the Articles is to preserve the peace of the Church,

> And, for the better observation and nourishing of the said peace, we have with some care and diligence drawn out and set down certain propositions, which we are persuaded to be true; and the copy whereof I send unto you here-inclosed, praying you to take care that nothing be public (ly) taught to the contrary; and that also in teaching of them

---

1 Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Book IX, viii. Note that Fuller is highly incensed at Rogers' book which I have cited before, for narrowing the 'charitable latitude' of the articles in the High Church direction, but he is willing to accept the Lambeth Articles as the doctrine of the Church!

2 Molhuysen, I, 413-415. Grotius infuriated Abbot by showing detailed knowledge of the making of the Articles. Only Andrewes could have been the source of that information. He tells Abbott that the words "in electis" were only included in the 5th Article after long deliberation, and that the Bishops had been very reluctant to adopt the article as it had been suggested by Whitaker.

> that discretion and moderation be used, that such as shall be in some points differing in judgment be not of purpose stung or justly grieved; and especially that no bitterness, contention, or personal reproofs or reproaches be used by any towards any. Which propositions nevertheless must so be taken and used as our private judgments, thinking them to be true and correspondent to the doctrine professed in this church of England, and established by the laws of the land, and not as laws and decrees. 1

Whitaker had died a week after his return to Cambridge, an event that was a grave blow to the English Calvinists. On December 8th Whitgift writes to Dr. Neville, the Master of Trinity, asking that Whitaker's manuscripts and notes which he had been preparing against Stapleton be saved for the archbishop, even though, as he had heard, the Queen was going to take his library. He adds:

> At Mr dean of Ely's and his last being here, we agreed of certain propositions, which are undoubtedly true, and not to be denied of any sound divine. But I know not how or by what means the same hath been signified to her majesty in evil sense; and as though the same had been by me sent down to the university to be disputed upon, or, (I know not how) published. It is the thing that I before something suspected, &c. [he means no doubt that he had been afraid that the Queen would find them objectionable.] But you that refuse advertisements, and think yourselves to have no need of advice. Otherwise these things had never grown to this extremity. The foolery of Dr Some hath done no good to the cause. Her majesty is persuaded of the truth of the propositions, but doth think it to be utterly unfit that the same should any ways be publicly dealt with either in sermon or disputation; as I think you are like further to understand ere it be long. I pray you, have me commended to Mr Vice-chancellor [Roger Goad] and let him understand as much from me; and desire him in the mean time so to use the said propositions, as there be no publication thereof, other-

---

1 Whitgift, Works, III, 611, ff.

> wise than in private. For indeed my meaning was only to let him and you understand that in these points I do concur with you in judgment, and will to the end, and mean not to suffer any man to impugn them openly or otherwise. And, when you shall have received the foresaid admonition from her majesty, I do wish that you should return answer to your chancellor your willingness to observe her majesty's commandment; but with signification of your assured persuasion of the truth of the foresaid propositions. This advice I would have you to give privately to Mr vice-chancellor, and to use it discreetly; but in no case to suffer these letters to go out of your own hands, but to keep them yourself, and either to burn them, or to bring them to me again at your coming hither. 1

He adds a warning to Baro, who was again threatening to 'trouble the Church', it appears, although we do not hear of any more disturbance until January 12th.

It is doubtful that her majesty was 'persuaded of the truth of these propositions'. It was probable, however, that she realized that such a narrowing of orthodoxy would lead only to more wrangling. Strype says:

> Certain it is, however the Queen liked of them, she liked not the method used in the effecting of them; and resented what the Archbishop and the rest had done; especially if they should permit them to be disputed and wrangled in the Schools. For in a short time after, she commanded Sir Robert Cecill, one of her Secretaries, to signify her mind to the Archbishop in this tenor: 'That her Majesty had heard, as of Mr Whitaker's death, so of some business he came up about. And that she had commanded him [the Secretary] to send unto his Grace, to acquaint him, that she misliked much that any allowance had been given by his Grace and the rest, of any such points to be disputed: being a matter tender and dangerous to weak ignorant minds, and thereupon that she required his Grace to suspend them.' 2

---

1 Ibid., pp. 615-617. Note Whitgift's hot exasperation at those who divide the Church against its enemies.

2 Strype, Whitgift, II, 286. Grotius says in a letter to his brother on February 25, 1641: "I...believe...that things will be brought back to the same form as that which

Whitgift's annoyance is understandable. He intends, however, to make the Articles do what they had been formulated to do: keep dissension from splitting the University and in turn the Church, and to keep the strength of the High Calvinists on the side of the discipline he espouses. There is no doubt, however, that he is also annoyed at that party for their reception of the Articles as a complete victory for them. The claim that the articles were formally suppressed, however, apparently has no basis in fact.

It is evident that Elizabeth had been informed of the content of the Articles by Burghley, and we know, from the reception he gave them, which I have already noted, his reasons for rejecting them. There is no reason to doubt that Elizabeth's were similar. Sir Philip Warwick in his Memoirs says that Whitgift "...unfortunately departed from his own usual prudence, and was prevailed on by Bishop Fletcher of London, and some others, in order only to the quieting university disputes, to determine against Baron, Margaret-professor, in those nine articles, usually called Lambeth Articles...."

> Which fact being made known unto Queen Elizabeth by the Lord Treasurer Burleigh, she was so displeased thereat, that these articles were quashed, and all threatened that had a hand therein to be attainted of a praemunire, so as soon after a copy of them was scarce to be found at Cambridge. 1

Andrew Bing wrote to Samuel Ward, master of Sidney

---

was established in the days of Elizabeth. It was this Queen who stifled in their very origin the Lambeth Articles which were a kind of prelude to the Synod of Dort."

[1] Page 90.

College, on November 3, 1626:

> My lord treasurer (who did much stomach my lord of Canterbury his greatness and power in Cambridge) took occasion to represent to the queen the archbishop's boldness in taking upon him to determine of articles of religion in a private conventicle held in his own conclave at Lambeth, never so much as once acquainting her majesty with it, and withal opened unto the queen how that he had hereby transgressed, besides rules of duty and good manners, the statute of submission of the clergy made 25 Henry VIII.,....All this (I suppose) my lord Burghley did not at Dr Baro's instigation (who I think was not so learned in our English statues), but out of his own judgment, to help the archbishop to a knock for meddling in his peculiar jurisdiction of the university. The archbishop was thereupon sent for by the queen and shrewdly shent and rebuked by her. Whereupon he sent post to Cambridge to fetch back that copy of the articles which was a little before (even a very few days) recommended by him unto every head of a college, with special direction not to press the embracing them upon any of their societies, whereunto they were formerly enjoined by him. It was my hap to be at Lambeth with my lord when this business was in agitation. 1

Bing goes on to say that at this time he heard Whitgift express himself in angry terms against Baro, for so presuming, especially as he was a foreigner, to disturb the peace of the Church. This is the echo of the message Whitgift had sent to Baro in his letter of December 8th. He ends there by saying:

---

1 MSS. Bodleian 290, Tanner clxvii.82. reproduced in Works of Whitgift, Parker Society, III, xvii-xviii.
John Plaifere claims in his Appeal to Gospel for True Doctrine of Divine Predestination...(1651) that "...when the life of Dr Whitacre was written by a learned Friend of his, who would have inserted these nine Conclusions, they were by Authority suppressed;" The same claim is made elsewhere in Arminian writings, but there seems to be no further evidence for it. Whitaker's Opera Omnia were published in 1610.

> You may also signify to Dr Baro that her majesty is greatly offended with him, for that he being a stranger and so well used dare presume to stir up or maintain any controversy in that place of what nature soever. And therefore advise him from me utterly to forebear to deal therein hereafter. I have done my endeavor to satisfy her majesty concerning him; but how it will fall out in the end I know not. Non decet hominem peregrinum curiosum esse in aliena republica. I write this to you as to my good and trusty friend, and as a feeling member of that body; and I cannot but commend very greatly her majesty's great care in these matters, being of the same mind myself.

It is thus apparent that Baro is the object of the attack on Barrett, and that the Articles are aimed at him. Baro was, moreover, called to London and the Articles shown to him. He was asked whether he consented to them and apparently said that he did, after raising one or two objections. Strype says that he told Whitgift "...that they might not be understood in any wise to contradict any of the articles of religion established; nor yet to run into the extreme consequences: as, that God hated his own workmanship, as he was man, without regard that he was a sinner."[1]

Although, as we have seen, Whitgift had specifically asked that "such as should be in some points differing in judgment, might not be of purpose stung, or justly grieved", it is apparent that the High Calvinists lost no time in letting it be known that their interpretation of these articles were the orthodox ones and no other. Baro, in a later letter to Whitgift, says he was forced to speak out again "...because he saw some there [at Cambridge] who took them in that sense, and so stretched them, as to fetch out and confirm from them all Piscator's paradoxes."[1]

---

[1] Whitgift, II, 289.

Baro evidently did not feel that he could remain silent in the face of such provocation. When Whitaker had made a final sermon on his side of the question before leaving for London for the making of the Articles, Baro had answered it with a sermon on the other side.[2] He felt he had to speak out again. Perhaps he felt he had been naive in assuming that the Articles left room for his principles also. It is evident from Whitgift's letter transmitting the Articles that he too thought that all interpretations possible under the Articles should be allowed. But this renewal of the battle put Baro in the position of having broken the peace enjoined upon him. On January 12th he preached a sermon on the 17th and 21st Articles, specifically reserving his right to have another interpretation of the Articles from that which the other party held,[3] including in it three or four points which again brought down the fire on his head. He had given warning before this in a letter to Burghley, which Strype summarizes:[1]

---

[1] Ibid., 291. Johannes Piscator, 1546-1625. German Zwinglian, Professor at Heidelberg.

[2] Ibid., 279.

[3] It is not clear from the sources whether this was contained in the sermon of the 12th or in an earlier one, but I am assuming that they were all in the same, since there was no reaction until after the 12th. It is apparent from the text of the 21st Article that if Baro alluded to it, he cannot be supported in his statement to Whitgift that he had not referred to the Lambeth Articles at all. The Article reads: (1563)
"Generalia Concilia sine iussu et voluntate principium congregari non possunt, et ubi convenerint, quia ex hominibus constant, qui non omnes spiritu et verbis Dei reguntur, et errare possunt, et interdum errarunt, etiam in hijs quae ad normam pietatis pertinent: ideo quae ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robur habent, neque auctoritatem nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta."
He could not better have brought out the biggest objection

> But as to the matters in controversy, you are not ignorant, most illustrious Lord, what my opinion is: namely, that these are the chief, that God is not the author of sin, nor would that it should be committed; when he openly forbids it, and reproves men for nothing but because of sin, which he hateth. And lastly that the faithful, or the elect, ought not to be secure of their salvation. These he said were the chief things which he and others defended. Which, he said, as he added, because there were certain articles which were said to be defined against them [he meant himself and others], which scarcely touched, he said, the state of the controversy: and were almost of that sort, that they might easily be proved, being dexterously understood. Nor did he require a new sense, but the same which might be fetched out of that letter of Mr Hooper [mentioned in his sermon] which he thought to be orthodox. But howsoever they were understood and wrested against them undeservedly, yet it was certain that he should obey his Lordship, and that he would keep peace as long as he should be there.[2]

As he claims later, Baro made no reference to the Articles as such in his sermon; he contented himself with attacking Piscator, whose doctrines he had found were being spread as orthodox. He summarized his sermon in his letter the next month[3] to Burghley:

> ...inter alia multa, media fere concione, haec tria dixi, de quibus postea sum in ius a domino procancellario vocatus. 1. Deum omnes in Adamo ad suam similitudinem, ac proinde ad vitam

---

to the Articles: they had not been produced even by a General Council, and yet they were being cited as dogma. It is my opinion, however (to save Baro's veracity) that there were actually two sermons, although the date of January 12th has been attached to both of them, and that Baro was speaking to Whitgift of the other one in which he did not refer to Article 21.

[1] Page 288. The date is not given, but it must have been before his crucial sermon.

[2] Ibid.

[3] February 9. Heywood and Wright, II, 96-98.

> aeternam, creasse: a qua etiam neminem arceret nisi propter peccatum, ut docet Damas,....2. Christum mortuum esse pro omnibus sufficienter: contra Joh. Piscatorem, hominem Germanum, qui id negat, cujus sententiam ecclesiae Anglicanae confessioni contrariam esse ostendi, ex articulis hujus regni parlamento approbatis, et regiae majestatis auctoritate confirmatis, articulo 31, cujus verba recitavi.[1] 3. Dei promissiones nobis in Christo factas, ut generaliter in sacris literis proponuntur, esse generaliter intelligendas, ut etiam habetur articulo Anglicanae confessionis 17.

But, he goes on, these three heads did not please certain ones who now try to persuade us that God made the greatest part of mankind, which he has created, and is every day creating, destined for destruction, that he might acquire glory to himself from their perdition; that Christ did not die for all because some of these people were created for destruction. And for the same cause, he says, they deny that the promises are general; they claim that they extend only to those few alone whom they say God created to save. The denial of these claims and his own doctrines are of the fundamentals of the Christian religion. He said nothing, he claims, against the Articles, nor intended anything.

Likewise in his letter to Whitgift two days after the sermon Baro states that the defenders of the Lambeth Articles had claimed that they superseded the Thirty-Nine Articles. He complained that it had come to such a pass that he 'and others' could not even say that God created the first man, and in him the rest, in His image, and thus to eternal life; he could not say that God did not reject any man as man, but solely as a sinner, nor that Christ was the propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, "as well original as actual" which were in fact the very words of the 31st Article. Or that the promises of God made in Christ were general and so to be taken, which were the words of the 17th Article.[1]

---

[1] Note the pointed humor here in his emphasis on the fact that Piscator is 'hominem Germanum', as he has been singled out for attack because he is a Frenchman, and also the great emphasis he gives to the fact that the article he quotes has been approved by Parliament and confirmed by the Queen's authority, in implied contrast to the Lambeth Articles which have neither of these stamps of approval.

The sermon is summarized somewhat otherwise in the record of the proceedings against Baro made by the notary before whom all the principals appeared. And here it seems that the principle of two wills in God appeared in this sermon of Baro's also.

Assertiones quaedam D. Baronis in concione habita ad clerum 12 Januarii

1. Docuit Deum omnes et singulos absoluta voluntate ad vitam aeternam creasse. Ratio. Creavit omnes ad suam imaginem, ergo ad beatam vitam; ac proinde neminem rejecit a salute, nisi ob peccatum superveniens.

2. Voluntatem Dei duplicem esse, viz. antecedentem et consequentem. Antecedente quidem voluntate Deum neminem rejecisse, alias improbasset opus suum. Ad hoc illustrandum adhibuit similitudenem Regis
   Patris
   Agricolae
   Rex leges fert ad civium commodum. Pater non gignit filium ad patibulum, aut ut exhaeredet. Agricola non ferit arborem, ut eradicat.

3. Christum mortuum esse pro omnibus et singulis, ut omnes et singuli scirent se in Christo remedium habere, juxta illud, Christus venit ad servandum quod perierat. Omnes autem et singuli perierant in Adamo, ergo etc. Nam remedium aeque late patere atque morbum, et Deum non esse προσωπολήπτην·

---

[1] Strype, *Whitgift*, II, 292.

4. Promissiones Dei ad vitam universales esse, et aeque spectare ad Cainum atque Abelem, Esaw atque Jacobum, Judam atque Petrum; et Cainum non magis a Deo fuisse rejectum quam Abelem, antequam se excluserat: Homines se excludere a caelo, non Deum, juxta illud, Perditio tua ex te, Israel. [1]

There follow the signatures of the witnesses and the notary.

In his letter to Whitgift, after the proceedings had been set in motion against him, Baro included, rather belatedly, an "orthodox explanation" of the Lambeth Articles, specifying the sense in which he could accept them, and in which his sermon was not a violation of them.[2]

This sermon, as the Vice-chancellor and Heads reported to Burghley in March, was one "Whereby his Adherents and Disciples were and are much emboldened...."[3] The administration had lost no time in informing Whitgift, although their first information to Burghley was given on January 29th. Goad told Whitgift that he had called Baro in when the Articles first came down to Cambridge and had showed him Whitgift's letter which said "...that nothing should be publicly taught to the contrary", and yet "the whole course" of his sermon the day before had been "concerning the same controversies." The text, moreover, he said, had given no occasion "to deal in those matters". Goad reports that he had consulted immediately with Chaderton and Clayton, and found them of his mind on the matter. He was nevertheless perplexed, he said, "...not seeing by what statute Baro might be dealt withal", and not having anyone else to consult, since many of the Heads were away. He is informing Whitgift before calling Baro before the Heads, and asking his advice. He is obviously suggesting that Whitgift might want to call Baro to account himself.[1]

---

[1] Heywood and Wright, II, 91-92.
[2] Strype prints them in the Whitgift, Appendix, III, 340-342.
[3] Strype, Annals, IV, 319 ff.

Whitgift answered on the 16th, expressing his sorrow that Baro "did...continue his troublesome course of contending", telling him that Baro had accepted the Articles at two separate times, and that he (Whitgift) suspected that he was getting encouragement from some in authority. If we accept the fact of the feud between Whitgift and Burghley, we may assume that Whitgift's reference is to the Lord Treasurer. Whitgift advises Goad to proceed cautiously, to call Baro before the Heads and require of him a copy of his sermon, or of the main points, and to send it to him in London. But he warns them not to do anything more than hold the hearings until they have sent the sermon to London, since there was "something ado there about the said propositions &c."[2]

Baro was arraigned solemnly enough before all the Heads on three separate occasions, and the facts were, as I have noted, established in due form by a notarized record. The only new item that appears there is their argument against his claim of general grace, that this doctrine is not only against the Articles, but also against experience, since Turks and other nations outside the Church have the external gifts of this life but are altogether deprived of grace sufficient for salvation.[1] This was evidently thought to need ballasting, and a statement was received from a group of divinity students, complaining that for the space of fourteen or fifteen years Baro had taught doctrines which were against the doctrines of the Church, appending a long list of them. The first one was: "Turcae et Judei in Deum credunt, quae est vera fides et ea quam in Symbolo confitemur."[2]

---

[1] Whitgift, II, 295.
[2] Ibid., 296-297.

After the third of these sessions, Goad wrote to Burghley, on the 29th of January, enclosing copies of the proceedings and charges thus far made, and telling him that since the affair is of such importance, he is also taking the liberty of informing the Archbishop. He says he will await Burghley's advice before proceeding further in the matter.

Ten days later, Baro also wrote to Burghley, summarizing his sermon, as I have noted above, and standing by his assertions. He claimed "he only defended the truth of the Gospel against Piscator, whose book he saw was in the hands of many of the younger students." He begs him not to resolve on any action until he knows the facts in the case.

Burghley's answer was to write a vigorous letter to the

---

[1] Heywood and Wright, II, 93-94.

[2] MS. Trin. Coll. Cambr. B.14.9. The letter of the Vice-Chancellor and Heads to Burghley said: "There is also since the former, another Complaint preferred against him by certain Batchelors in Divinity, that he hath, not only in that sermon, but also for the space of these 14 or 15 Years taught in his Lectures, preached in sermons, determined in the Schools, and printed in several Books, divers Points of Doctrine, not only contrary to himself, but also contrary to that which hath been taught and read ever since her Majesty's Reign, and agreeable to the Errors of Popery." (Strype, Annals, IV, 319 ff.)

Heads, of which, Strype says, only fragments remain, protesting their "so rigorous proceedings...in putting interrogatories to him, as though he were some great offender. "These matters", he said, "I cannot conceive as others take them. Ye shall punish him, if ye will; but ye shall do it for well-doing,...in holding the truth, in mine opinion. Ye sift him with interrogatories, as if he were a thief.... This seems done of stomach among you...." and furthermore: "the witnesses do not agree."[1]

Baro had also written to Andrewes, who was in London with the Archbishop, perhaps having gone there on purpose to intercede for Baro. Andrewes had earlier written to Baro asking his opinion on some of the issues which had now come up, and we have a reference by Baro to this letter. It may well be that this point had been chosen by consultation among Overall, Andrewes, Baro, and perhaps Harsnett, as an issue to force in this way. Baro's letter to Andrewes begins:

> Although, reverend brother, you have neither writ to me, (as you could not by reason of the time), nor have made any mention of me when you writ to our friend, Mr Harsnett; yet I hope mine came to you: by which I endeavoured to satisfy you, as to those letters which, upon my departure, I received from you. And in which besides I included other things; which I would by no means should be lost. 2

He summarizes the proceedings that have been set on foot against him, revealing that Overall had "openly and freely professed his consent unto him (Baro) in these things", and

---

1 Strype, Whitgift, II, 304.
2 Ibid., 304.

that Clayton had done the same earlier. He knows, however, from the actions of Goad, that the decision lies with Whitgift, and he begs Andrewes to intercede on his behalf.

He tells Andrewes also that Overall had the day before showed him a book in English, dedicated to Essex, "Wherein these positions were openly taught and defended: *that Christ died for all, neither sufficiently nor efficaciously*,...And in the margin also, that *we must not pray for all men*,... Also, that *God willeth sin and worketh it*. Which is more, saith he, than to permit or suffer it to be done;...Where also, answering to this question, *whether God is the author of sin*? he saith, *he is not, and he is*. Which nevertheless after he endeavoureth to explain. And the book was printed at London by the widow Orwin, dwelling in Paternoster Row, at the sign of the Talbot, 1594."[1] He goes on to mention the fact that Perkins has attacked Overall in his own pulpit, and transmits Overall's message to Whitgift.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 305. Manningham's *Diary* (ed. John Bruce, Camden Society, London, 1868, p. 27) records the sermon on May 13, 1602, at the Temple Church, of "One Moore of Baliol Colledge in Oxford; his text Amos iii.6 'Shall there be evil in the city and the Lord hath not done it?' *Malum culpe et malum poene*; of the latter onely God is the author. God may be said to be the author of sin permissive, and an actor in synn, though not the author of the synne, for ther is no action but he is the first cause of it; and yet he is noe partner or cause of the il in the action, noe more then he which rideth upon a lame iade, can be said to be the cause of his limpinge, though he be the cause of his paceinge, nor a cunning musician the cause of discordes when he playeth on a lute that is out of tune." The book mentioned is Perkins' *A treatise tending unto a Declaration whether a Man Be in the Estate of Damnation* which the *Short Title Catalogue* lists (No. 19754) as renewed in 1595. Martin Marprelate had complained of Whitgift (Strype, *Whitgift*, III, Appendix xlii.) "That he (Whitgift) erected a new Printer, one Thomas Orwin, contrary to the Decree of Star-Chamber." The 1612 edition of this work seems to have been considerably revised.

It seems that at this time Baro also wrote to Junius, a fact which Strype does not mention, although the text of the letter is contained in the MS. from which he is quoting in all his history of this affair.[1] Baro does not cite it, since it was not favorable to his side of the case. It is curious that the Calvinists of a later day did not bring it up, for Junius was a name to conjure with theologically for many years after 1595. It may well be, however, that it was an Arminian who discovered it and put the heading on it which it now bears: "Junius ad D'em. Baronem - Responsio ad Ep[isto]am P. Baronis quaerentis, ut videtur sententiam suam de controversis Anglicis." Junius ends by asserting that although God had proposed grace for salvation to all men, it was effectual only for the elect. Some commentator of a later date has also added the 'theses' of Junius to the end of the MS.

On February 4th Baro sends Whitgift another appeal in a letter which he transmits by his son. He claims that these attacks are being made on him merely because he is in favour of "the rights and state of this church, and acquiesced in it." He repeats the points that he had made in his sermon and asserts that they are the "very foundations of the Christian religion." He repeats also his claim that he had not mentioned the Articles and that he had not spoken against them, but only against Piscator. He has, he says, gone to Goad and asked him to "explain of what matters controverted he understood it" that Baro had transgressed, and had been refused an answer. He promised Whitgift that he would do his best to keep from further trouble, but "an occasion would easily be taken by one word."

---

[1] MS. Trin. Coll. Cambr. B.14.9.

In the end, it seems that the intervention of Andrewes prevailed, and Whitgift called off the prosecution, only telling Baro to forebear those arguments in the future. Baro writes his thanks in a letter which I have already quoted, but ends by insisting that the things he had preached were still true.

On April 1st Baro wrote a letter to Nicholas Hemmingius, the Danish professor with whose ideas on predestination he agreed, as we have seen in discussing the Summa trium, urging Hemmingius to go on with his published explanations and illustrations of Melanchthon on predestination. He tells Hemmingius that his smaller treatises were published "some few years ago at Geneva" but the preface, which appears to be by Beza, "draws it over to his own meaning." He adds a note of conditions in England:

> In this country we have hitherto been permitted to hold the same sentiments as yours on grace; but we are now scarcely allowed publicly to teach our own opinions on that subject, much less to publish them. 1

Baro was, however, to be sacrificed to the opposition nevertheless, for when it came time for him to stand for reelection to his professorship, he did not do it. Since he

---

1 Nichols, Works of Arminius, I, 91. My thesis, that it is the Calvinists who move in on doctrine during this period seems to be borne out here by Baro.

had become a controversial figure, and since he was a foreigner, the party concurred, apparently, in letting him be dropped. Fuller's claim that

> ...he saw the Articles of Lambeth...lately sent to the University, and foresaw that subscription thereunto would be expected from-yea, imposed on - him, to which he would not condescend: and therefore resolved to quit his place. 1

is obviously mistaken. Baro makes clear, in a letter to Burghley dated the 17th of September, that his decision to retire is his own. This also settles the dispute which has gone on between the Arminians and the Calvinists as to whether he was removed from his post or decided to retire voluntarily. It hinged on whether the professorship was biennial or triennial. By Baro's own admission it was a biennial election. He leaves, however, insisting that his sentiments

---

1 *History of Cambridge*, p. 213. Fuller's humor at his expense, in the passage which follows, is ponderously theological: "So that this his departure was not his free act, out of voluntary election, but that whereunto his will was necessarily determined: witness his own return to a friend, requiring of him the cause of his withdrawing: *Fugio*, saith he, *ne fugarer*, 'I fly, for fear to be driven away.'" He feels some qualms about the action, but he manages to resolve them: "Some conceive this hard measure, which was used to one of Dr Baro's qualifications. For, First, *he was a foreigner*, a Frenchman: *Turpius ejicitur, quam non admittitur, hospes*. Secondly, *A great Scholar*; for, he who denieth learning in Baro, (so witnessed in his works,) plainly affirmeth no scholarship in himself. Thirdly, *An unofensive man* for life and conversation; seeing nothing of viciousness could be charged upon him, which, otherwise, in his contest with Mr Chaderton, had been urged against him. Lastly, *An aged man*, coming hither many years since (when the Professor's place as much needed him as he it,) and who had painfully spent his strength in the employment. Others alleged, that in such cases of conscience there lies no plea for courtesy; and that Baro, as he was a *stranger*, had brought in *strange* doctrines, to the infecting of the University, the fountain of learning and religion; and therefore Archbishop Whitgift designed the removing of him from his place."

on predestination are valid, and he sends a copy of them to Burghley at this time professing himself ready to retract if Burghley can show that they are false. The letter is worth reproducing in full:

> Illustrissimo prudentissimoque viro, domino Guiliermo Cicilio, summo Anglice thesaurio et academiae Cantabrigiensis cancellario dignissimo.
>
> Quod me, abhinc aliquot mensibus omni auxilio destitutum, tuo favore tutari volueris, illustrissime domine, jam egi et habeo gratia quantas possum maximas. Quoniam autem existimo eos qui mihi non ita benevolunt in me, quum renovanda erit mea ad praelegandi munus electio (quod sub finem Novembris, biennio scilicet tum exacto, fieri debet), aliquid molituros, nec sit praeter te (Maecenas optime) ad quem potius confugere debeam, possim, aut velim, quam ad tuam unius dominationem, ab ea suppliciter peto, ut mihi, tum pro tua in literatos benevolentia, auxilio esse velis, quo in hoc praelegandi munere continuari possim, hoc saltem biennio, ne cum aliqua famae jactura, quorundam factione, ejectus videar. Meam autem de praedestinatione sententiam, ex qua haec adversus me, orta est invidia, ad te, mihi plurimum observande domine, mitto; rogans ut si eam per tua gravissima negotia perlegere possis, qualis si ipse judices, et sumne ego, propter eam, tuo favore eoque in tua academia numero indignus. Et tamen hac conditione mitto, ut si quid in ea falsi, (quod vix existimem, quum sit haec plurimum reformatarium ecclesiarum sententia) sed tamen si quid in ea falsi aut obscure offenderit tua singularis eruditio, illud emendare, hoc vero explicare paratus sum: sin vero sit haec sententia vera humiliter per Deum immortalem precor, ut et tua pieta favere velit, tali enim certe indiget haec veritas patrono, ne forte opprimatur. Nec, tamen, si in hoc praelegandi munere confirmatus tua auctoritate fuerim, mihi propone hanc quaestionem pluribus cum illius offensione agitare, sed parce et modeste, si quando locus id postularit, attingere; aut ab ea etiam penitus, si id tua dominatio ex academiae utilitate fore judicet, abstinere, et de aliis theologiae capitibus disserere. Itaque de me, illustrissime Domine, pro tuo arbitrio statues; ego enim is sum, qui aut loqui aut tacere, te jubente, tam paratus sim, quam Deum optimum maximum oro, ut te, literatorum ac praecipue Cantabrigiensum tuorum praesidium, huic regno et ecclesiae nobisque incolumem conservet.
>
> Londini, 17 die Septemb. anno Domini 1596
>
> Tuae dominationis humillimus servus, P. Baro.[1]

---

[1] MS. Lansd. no. 82, art. 91, printed in Heywood and Wright, I, 99-100.

His appeal went unanswered, as far as we know, and he retired to London to live there until his death in April 1599. Thomas Plaifere, Fellow of St. John's, and a rigid High Calvinist who had taken a prominent part in the attacks on Baro, succeeded to his professorship. Bancroft's gesture in connection with Baro's death I have already described.

The Arminians were the more ready to grant the High Calvinists the reversion of the Lady Margaret professorship since, on the death of Whitaker, they had succeeded in having John Overall elected Regius Professor of Divinity. It was apparently considered usual for the Lady Margaret professor to succeed to the Regius professorship, but Baro in his letter to Burghley in January had renounced any claim to the post. The candidate against Overall was Anthony Wotton, a High Calvinist, and for the first time a competition was held to decide who should get the post. Whitgift was afraid that Overall was too factious. He said in his letter of December 8th, 1595, which I have already cited:

> Salutem in Christo. I have received your letters touching Mr Overall, and I very much rely upon your judgment in that case. Nevertheless I am informed by some others that Mr Overall is something factious and inclined to that sect, that loveth to pick quarrels to the present state and government of the church; which I hope not to be true because of your commendation. But I think you shall receive letters in her majesty's name for due care to be had in electing a person meet for that place. And therefore I do assure myself that you will be careful to provide such an one as shall be in all points conformable.

His confusion in thinking that Overall was one of the sect which was disturbing the peace is probably only evidence of how completely confused the primate had become about the issues in the case. It is evident, however, that Overall had been able to conciliate the heads and professors far enough to gain their recommendation for the post. Whitgift's words are even more puzzling, since in his message to Andrewes by Baro that I have quoted above, it is apparent that Overall has had the support of the archbishop, as well as the High Calvinist Bishop Fletcher of London, in his doctrinal position taken in sermons in his church.[1] This may well be strong evidence that Overall had made himself heard in Baro's defence, and become identified with him in Whitgift's mind.[2]

---

[1] Miss Overall, in her thesis on Overall, says of Baro's words: (p. 240, note 6): "This is another rather puzzling statement. If it means that Richard Fletcher, who succeeded Aylmer as Bishop of London in 1594, secured from the Calvinistic Archbishop Whitgift some special dispensation or protection for Overall's non-Calvinistic preaching, then Fletcher's reputation as an ardent Predestinarian must be a mistake of history....In view of historical facts, it seems that Baro was very probably mistaken in his opinion as to what Overall had said, unless Overall had a greater sense of humor or a greater command of sarcasm than he is credited with having." As I have demonstrated, Whitgift was probably by no means as high a Calvinist as Fletcher, and it may be that the initiative in this matter of protection had come from him. It is not puzzling, moreover, at this stage of development, that matters of discipline should take precedence over matters of doctrine. The Bishops accepted the fact that part of the system of which they were instruments was the latitude of the articles. Their position, like Elizabeth's, was that if the discipline of the Church were observed, and a few basic Reformed doctrines upheld, a reasonable latitude was obligatory. To both Fletcher and Whitgift it would appear far worse that a 'lecturer' should come into a man's own parish and controvert his sermons to his people, thus destroying confidence in the Church, than that that priest should have preached a liberal doctrine of predestination. Perhaps Giles Fletcher, the Bishop's brother had a part in it. He had contributed verses to Baro's Praelectiones.

[2] Baker, in his History of St John's College, says of Overall (p. 259): "...Juvenis admodum venit in amicitiam Petri Baronis, ideque dedicit de decretis divinis modeste sentire et caute loqui: mediam iniit viam, progressurus forte ulterius,

The subjects set for the lectures in competition for the post exhibit someone's sense of humor. It was perhaps Dr. Thomas Neville, Master of Trinity, who had suggested Overall for the post, since he was generally known to be the agent of Elizabeth and Burghley at Cambridge.[1] At any rate Overall was given Hebrews vi, 4: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift,...if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance....", which would fit not at all badly with the doctrine that his party had defended, since it assumes that the elect can fall from grace. To Anthony Wotton, however, was given a text which was a stumbling-block to all High Calvinists: James ii, 24: "Ye see than how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." If the Queen or Burghley were indeed seeing to it that Overall should be elected (he was Chaplain-in-ordinary to the Queen), they had stacked the cards well. Overall took the line that repentance was of no avail, although he was to modify that doctrine considerably before the end of his career.

The facts in the life of Overall have been admirably assembled by Miss Overall in her thesis, and he will enter more fully into this narrative at the time of Grotius' visit to England. There is some confusion of authorities as to whether Overall was a thorough-going Arminian. Bishop Burnet

---

Nisi Baronis vestigia deterrusissent. Quod si controversiam istam non plene dilucidavit aut penitus exhausit, (quis enim sufficit istis?) viam certe stravit posteris."

[1] It was Neville who went as the Anglican emissary to meet James on his progress from Scotland to be crowned in London.

in his Exposition of the xxxix Articles says: "Bishop Overal...espoused the Arminian tenets."[1] Bishop Hall called him 'a candid Arminian',[2] but later in his autobiography he said that "Mr Montagu [in his Appello Caesarem] meant to express, not Arminius, but B. Overall, a more moderate and safe Authour, however he sped in delivery of him..."[3] I have already cited his review of the principles at stake between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants in Holland, and shown how Overall makes clear that he considers the English Church holds a position different from both. George Carleton, who wrote against Montague, claimed Overall as a Calvinist because he says Overall upheld Rainolds at the Hampton Court Conference in his assertion that the elect could not fall finally from grace.[4] And Davenant wrote to Ward on March 6, 1626 that Overall subscribed to the Lambeth Articles.[5] It seems apparent that he was able to make both sides believe that he was of their number.

Several commentators insist that he was in a class by himself in his doctrine of grace. Plaifere, in his Appeal to Gospel,[6] lists his as a separate doctrine: that God decreed to create man good, that he foresaw the Fall but that he decreed to send his son to offer salvation to all men, that some men only, however, have the special grace wherewith to be saved. A. T. Russel says:

---

[1] Oxford, 1796, p. 197.
[2] Works, twelve volumes, Oxford 1837-1839, XII, 400.
[3] "Some Specialties of Divine Providence in His Own Life", 1660, cited above.
[4] Examination of those things, etc.
[5] Fuller, Church History, V, 226, note z by Brewer. But as we have seen, Baro also accepted them, and so did Andrewes.
[6] Cited above. He was the son of the High Calvinist who succeeded Baro. Plaifere objects to this doctrine of Overall's since he does not approve of distinguishing between common Grace and Special Grace. This was, of course, the sense in which the later rational Arminians differed from their beginnings.

> Overall maintained a middle way between the theology of his times and that of the Anti-predestinarians, He taught that God vouchsafed a certain measure of grace to all men, but secured salvation to the elect by a still more abundant measure. He taught that some had true faith and grace for a time and then fell away; but that those who are believers, who are included in the divine decree of election, cannot, either totally or finally fall or perish, but by a special and efficacious grace so persevere in a true and lively faith, that at length they are brought to eternal life. [1]

Montague was able to cite him on the view that some had the true grace for a time and then fell away, while Carleton also quotes him to the effect that those who are really elect can not fall away totally or finally. The thing that made Overall an Arminian at the time was the fact that his doctrine left the way open for a man to affect the course of his own salvation, even though he phrased it in such a way as to please those who believed that Grace was irresistible. Everyone was potentially the recipient of sufficient grace for salvation. But it must be remembered, that however this doctrine pleased the Calvinists later, it was at this time anathema to them.[2] For the Counter-Remonstrants and the

---

[1] A. T. Russel, Memoirs of...Lancelot Andrewes, Cambridge, 1860, p. 63. This was also later called Baxterianism. Mozley says: (The Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, London, 1855, p. 190 n.) "Bishop Overall appears to have fallen into the error of endeavouring to combine irresistible grace to some with sufficient grace to all."

[2] Miss Overall reproduces with her thesis the Notes of Dr. Samuel Knight for a Biography of John Overall, MS. ADD. 48, pp. 255-262: "The Censure of a Sermon Preached at St Mary's in Cambridge by Dr Overall." This is the way he put it at that time:
"Concerning Universality of Grace. For universality of Grace (Although I doubt not but God doth give to all men

High Calvinists the decree, as Overall himself notes, of God's predestination was "particularis", and it was radical and heretical for it to be universal, or general from the beginning.[1] His distinction between the two kinds of grace enabled him to be on both sides of the quarrel about whether a man could fall totally or finally from grace, but there is little doubt about which side he favored emotionally, from his comments about the High Calvinists, at the time of Grotius' visit in 1613. High Calvinist spies had reported to Bishop Aylmer early in his career the fact that Overall had preached that Christ died for all men, and he had lost his charge on that account. One of the elements in the growth of Arminianism, (which later received such a poor reputation for its social adherences) was the fact

---

and that of his mere grace some lights for the knowledge of sin with other motions of grace and that the end and purpose thereof is and so should of them be used to bring them to repentance and to remove out of their souls darknesse sin dooth () yet besides the general grace and conditional will of God in regard whereof (by the fathers and Zanchy lib. 3 misc.: cap. 1) it is truly said that God would have all men to be saved: yet there is a more speciall grace of God to be confessed whereby according to his absolute will and constant purpose he doth effectually...call and bring some men to repentance and faith persuasive and salvation which spiritual grace is not universal but proper to the Elect whom God of his free mercies in Xt. without provision of anything in them moving thereunto hath eternally out of the masse of perdition, (wherein he foresaw that all the children of Adam (by Adams fall through the abuse of his freewill) should be born and without this offered grace finally remain) elected and predestinated to certain salvation." Free will he claims later is "a working cause under Grace" ...only in conversion is the will not an agent.

[1] As Overall himself specifies in the transcript of one of his lectures in U.L.C. MS. Gg.1.29, 123a-126b, reproduced with Miss Overall's thesis.

that the clergy in their parishes were aware that the doctrinaire Calvinism they received in the Universities was likely to drive their more untutored parishioners to despair. Overall, answering the charges that had been made by a Mr. Hill,[1] told Aylmer that he was requested "to come visit some of my parish that were sick", and found them sicker in mind than in body;[2] "They could not be persuaded that Christ dyed for them. Wherein, having by the comforts of the Gospell, as I thought best, somewhat eased and perswaded them, I tooke occasion afterward in my Sermon, for their sakes, to handle this point, that, Everie one was bounde to believe in Christ, that is, that he dyed for his Sinnes, and namely, to gather them out of the Generall, Christ dyed for All Cor, 5...."

His doctrine, that everyone was bound to believe, is Baro's heresy that aroused Chaderton: that faith is enjoined by the law. The ease with which a free-will doctrine could be deduced from this is shown by his explanation as it continues:

---

[1] U.L.C. MS. Gg.1.29., page 119a has the text of this report to Aylmer. The 'Positions' Overall took were: that "Reprobation is for Sinne"; "Christ dyed for all, that is, for everie singular man in the world,"; "Christ is offered to everie singular man"; "In the Day of Judgment neither Originall, no Actuall Sinne shall condemne, but only Infidelitie."; "The Reprobates rise again by vertue of Christs Resurrection".

[2] Overall thesis page 231. Cf. Burton's inclusion of Religious Melancholy in his Anatomy. It may well be that a great part of the well-known phenomenon of "Jacobean Melancholy", about which so much has been heard, was the result of this awakening of the mass of the populace to the Reformation doctrines as refined and preached to them by the bright young men from the Universities, who had learned only the terms of absolute predestination.

> Christ dyed for all men Sufficiently, for the Beleevers only Effectually; as the Sunne that shineth sufficiently to give light to all, though it doth it effectually only to them that open their eyes; as water that is sufficient to quench all the thirstie, but doth it onely to them that drink it; as Physick that is sufficient to cure all maladies, but doth it effectually only where it is applyed. 1

We may assume then that Strype's conclusion is essentially correct. He says:

> However clear Overal was of that Charge mentioned before [of being factious] of the Archbishop, it appeared that his Judgment did not fully square with those Lambeth Propositions. 2

Contemporary confirmation may be found in the fact that the copy of the Lambeth Articles included in the Historical MSS Commission's publication of the Salisbury Papers (Vol. V,

---

1 Ibid.

2 Strype, Whitgift, II, 480.
Overall, of course, takes his place with the Arminians in his position on discipline and the political place of the Church. He wrote the part of the Catechism on the Sacraments. His Convocation Book which was the record of Convocation called in 1605 to enact canons for the protection of the monarchy after the Gunpowder Plot (it was not published until 1690, by Bishop Sancroft, to justify the action of the Non-Jurors), denied the social compact idea, and established the source of government in the absolute gift of God. It concludes that "he doth greatly erre" who believes that "all civil power, Jurisdiction, and Authority was first derived from the people, and disorder'd multitude...or...deduced from their consents naturally from them; and is not God's ordinance originally descending from him." James refused to give his consent to it, however, since he thought that it favored too much the idea that a King de facto who was not a King de iure might claim the allegiance of the subject. Hooker, of course, stated a compact theory of government, and also specifically stated that a King de facto, (because Providence had demonstrated his right to hold the crown since it had permitted him to win it,) was thus a King de iure. Overall, of course, was only one of the members of the Convocation which produced it. Abbot, the High Calvinist who was later Archbishop, also approved it.

London, 1894, page 478) has immediately following them a note in another hand: "Whether Dr. Overall hath dealt against the 5. and 7. propositions, our University students do easily remember."

The High Calvinists were to rise up against Overall as they had against Baro, and on the same issues, no matter how much he was able to make them think he was partly of their opinion at the beginning. In 1600 there was another quarrel, but this time the sacrifice of Baro in the matter of the Lambeth Articles bore fruit; for Overall was able to maintain himself merely by suggesting that he might bring the matter to the attention of the Archbishop.

In 1598 Overall had to be installed as Master of Catherine Hall by direction of the Queen, after the Senior Fellows had voted for him, and the Junior Fellows had voted for Dr. Simon Robson of St. John's. The Juniors appealed to the Vice-chancellor, who was told that Whitgift wanted Overall. It was not settled, however, until both sides appealed to the Queen, who upheld Whitgift.

Overall's troubles rose from the fact that, although he held that the truly elect could not fall from grace (a doctrine he was to defend at the Hampton Court Conference) totally or finally, he held that even the justified, if they did fall temporarily, were subject to God's wrath. The two sides to this affair are very fully contained in documents which remain.[1] It is apparent that Dr. Some was the instigator of the trouble again.[1] The battle lasted from June 1599, when Some preferred charges against Overall "for teaching", as Overall puts it, "some erroneous points of doctrine, as he sayd, in my Readings and Determinations in the Schools, which he exhibited written, in a paper, but somewhat otherwise then I had delivered them." Overall was asked to put down his doctrines in writing, which he delivered to the Heads. In September he was sent for by Goad and Chaderton and the result of their condensation of them into five questions was read to him, preparatory to argument about them.[2] They were:

---

[1] The High Calvinists report it in letters contained in Hist. MSS. Commission Salisbury Papers, London, 1904, pp. 208-211. Overall's version is in U.L.C. MS. Gg.1.29, pp. 102-105, and also in identical terms in B.M. MS. Harl. 7043, pp. 392-395.

---

[1] Robert Some, who died in 1609, was by this time Vice-Chancellor, a post which he was to hold a total of four times, probably more by reason of his indefatigability than any affection in which he could be held. His personality was extremely distasteful to Whitgift, as I have mentioned. He had spoken for the early Puritans, preaching against pluralities and non-residence in 1570, and supporting Cartwright (Athenae Cant., II, 510-511). He was in the thick of these quarrels I am describing in his writings also, producing The Perpetuity of Faythe in 1593, and, in 1596, his Three Questions, one of which was "Christ died for the Elect alone" (in the Latin translation of 1602, published at Basle, is added: "Non pro singulis hominibus"). This latter work was published in Harderwick in 1613 in Latin at the time of the publication of Baro's Summa Trium, as part of the propaganda in England to help the Counter-Remonstrant cause. Even Martin Marprelate could not away with 'M. Some'. J. Dover Wilson in an article on "Martin Marprelate and Shakespeare's Fluellen" (Library, Third Series, III (1912), 270) quotes his verdict on Some in "M. Some laid open", which is an accurate characterization of the mentality which pushed the Lambeth Articles and the dogmas of High Calvinism. Martin says: "If a man mark it, there is much ado throughout his whole book with his writings, his words, his reasons, his answers, his sermons, etc. which it seemeth he would fain fasten upon posterity for laws and statutes as if the ground of all good knowledge were graven in the very wrinkles of his forehead." His funeral preachers were Laurence Chaderton and John Cotton.

[2] Salisbury MSS., pp. 210-211. Thomas Goad, the son of Roger Goad, who has figured prominently in these disputes for the High Calvinists, replaced Bishop Hall as one of the

> 1. Homo electus justificatus in gravia peccata justificatione imputata caret, donec resipiscat.
> 2. Homo electus justificatus lapsus in gravia peccata amittit ad tempus fidem justificantem.
> 3. Mahometem sive Turcam et Papam simul constituere Antichristum illum in Scripturis praedictum, est verisimile.
> 4. Animam Christi tam ad Caetum damnatorum quam quam beatorum concessisse, nihil in scripturis impedit.
> 5. Animas patrum ante Christi ascensionem, etsi fuerint in limu Abrahae et loco beatitudinis, non tamen fuisse in caelo proprie dicto, constat.

These Overall held affirmatively, the rest denied. It appears that although both sides had been enjoined to silence on the question, Some delivered a hot sermon against Overall's stand. Overall took his opportunity at the Commencement exercises, when he was given the part ad commendationem after the regular disputation, which was decided by Some the Vice-chancellor and Heads in favor of two questions of which Overall could not approve. The High Calvinist report says:

> Dr Overall, forgetting himself, entered into a refutation of the Vice-Chancellor's determination, which action of his was very offensive to the auditory in regard both of matter and manner. Of matter, for he dealt against the truth. Of manner, for the like was never done before, and is flat against all order of disputation.

Some was only too happy to deliver a round and public rebuke to Overall, and the next day Plaifere

> ...entered into a defence of the Vice-chancellor's reasons and discovered and refuted Dr Overall's

---

English emissaries to the Synod of Dort, when Hall fell ill. He, however, apparently had a change of heart, for in 1719 there was published a "Disputation concerning the Necessity and Contingency of Events, in respect of God's Eternal Decrees" (printed in a Collection of Tracts, ed. Paine and Bellmann, Oxford) attributed to him, in which he abandons the Calvinistic doctrines entirely, in favor of an even more philosophic statement of necessity and contingency and free will than Baro's or Hooker's.

> dealing the day before with such soundness, learning and perspicuity as did greatly content and satisfy the assembly. If some of his speeches were somewhat sharp in regard of the manner, they which love the truth will bear a little with him because he dealt against him which had faulted both in matter and manner, and whose public oppositions against the truth are most notorious.

Overall does not mention this incident at the Commencement, but he does mention one night after dinner when he was suddenly called to a full meeting of the Consistory to hear a full confutation of his views. Overall relates:

> After this Confutation read, it was (expected) the Vice Chancellor should proceede to sentence my positions, as Errors of Doctrine: but I putt forth a Question, which appeared to (throw) them into a Great Maze; whether they thought it not meete, before they proceeded any further herein, to acquaint my Lord of Canterbury his Grace herewithall.
>
> Whereunto was sayd diversly, that it was needlesse; It would be a trouble to his Grace; his Grace would not like of it; that his Graces Judgmt was utterly against these points; that it would diminish the Authority of the Universitie...finally, that the matter was not yet ripe: and thereupon the papers of Arguments and Confutation were restored back again...and a larger Confutation promised. Wch afterwards was made, and sent about to the Heads, and communicated unto divers others but not to mee, though the title of it was, that it was made for my better satisfaction.
>
> After, there was much Invaying against this opinion in Sermons that a justified man in grievous sinne should loose his justification. Especially after that Mr Provost on the Annunciation Day had sett it on foote, confuting this as a Popish opinion, that justifying Grace, might be lost by Mortall sinnes. And that this, namely, Perpetuitie of Justifying Grace once given, as Certaintie of Salvation, was our freehold, and therefore in no Case to be lett goe of.

The consternation of Some and the Heads at the mere suggestion that these questions be presented to Whitgift demonstrates which side had finally prevailed, as far as the administration of the Church was concerned. The High Calvinists say that

Overall was silenced, but there is no record of it. On July 22, 1600, Some wrote to Burghley:

> Of Cambridge accidents. God's truth has been shrewdly grated on by some of very unsound judgment. The parties have been advised to embrace the truth. On refusal, they were required to forebear public opposition. How this was performed, appeared in our divinity schools heretofore in Dr Baro the Frenchman, and of late in Dr Overall. The one is dead, and I desire the death, not of the other man, but of his errors. The University is a precious fountain: if that be corrupted, it must needs be wide with the rivers, and give a grievous blow to truth and peace. Divers points that have been publicly delivered lead to popery, and may be compared to the cockatrice eggs and spider's web. 1

In the long run, Whitgift's purpose in sanctioning the Lambeth Articles was accomplished. Quarrels within the University remained there. Mullinger in his University of Cambridge says that after this time:

> The Master, if he differed from the Articles in his interpretation of any particular dogma, deemed it prudent to abstain from too open an avowal of his private belief; the fellows, if his opinions were orthodox, no longer ventured to combine for the purpose of ousting him from his office simply because his theological sympathies were at variance with those of the majority among themselves. 2

They became for the Puritans a codification of what should be restored doctrinally to the Church. The first head of the troubles of the Church which Rainolds put up for discussion at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 was: "That the doctrine of the church might be preserved in purity ac-

---

1 Salisbury, p. 241.
2 II, 381.

cording to God's word."[1] He goes on:

> For the first, may your Majesty be pleased that the Book of Articles of Religion, concluded on 1562, may be explained where obscure, enlarged where defective: viz., whereas it is said, (Article the 16th), 'After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace', those words may be explained with this, or the like addition: 'Yet neither totally nor finally'. To which end it would do very well if the nine orthodoxall assertions concluded on at Lambeth might be inserted into the Book of Articles.

This occasioned Bancroft's outbreak, demanding that the Conference be put an end to. James gently rebuked him, and Bancroft went on:

> Upon the first motion concerning falling from grace, may your majesty be pleased to consider how many in these days neglect holiness of life, presuming on persisting in grace upon predestination - 'If I shall be saved, I shall be saved,' - a desperate doctrine, contrary to good divinity, wherein we should reason rather *ascendendo* than *descendendo*, from our obedience to God, and love to our neighbor, to our election and predestination. As for the doctrine of the Church of England touching predestination, it is in the very next paragraph, viz.,
> We must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture; and in our doings that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.

The King approved of this statement as an answer, suggesting only that the word "often" or the like be inserted to "clear the doctor's doubts". Then he reveals that he feels on this subject the way the Arminians do. In this sense he was to be consistent in his statements throughout his reign; he did not approve of the handling of the "deep points" in the pulpit. He says:

---

[1] I quote here and later from Fuller's account of the Conference, Book X, pp. 275 ff., ed. Brewer, which seems to me to be as full and fair as any extant.

> Meantime I wish that the doctrine of predestination may be tenderly handled, lest on the one side God's omnipotency be questioned by impeaching the doctrine of his eternal predestination; or on the other side a desperate presumption arreared, by inferring the necessary certainty of persisting in grace.[1]

Rainolds later returns to the point:

> And here again I could desire that the nine orthodoxal assertions received at Lambeth may be generally received.

The King answers:

> ...As for the nine assertions you speak of, I cannot suddenly answer, not knowing what those propositions of Lambeth be.

Bancroft hastens to enlighten him, and to indicate by his phrasing the way in which the Arminians viewed them, as "determinations" affecting only doctrinal disputes within the Universities, and not to be pushed into the dogmas of the whole Church. He says:

> May it please your majesty, this was the occasion of them: by reason of some controversies in Cambridge about certain points of divinity, my lord's grace assembled some divines of special note to set down their opinions, which they drew into nine Assertions, and so sent them to the University for the appeasing of those quarrels.

The King comments:

> When such questions arise amongst scholars, the quietest proceedings were to determine them in the university, and not to stuff the Book of Articles with all conclusions theological. Secondly, the better course would be to punish the broachers of false doctrine, than to multiply Articles, which, if never so many, cannot prevent the contrary opinions of men till they be heard.

Overall broke in at this point:

---

[1] Page 281.

> May it please your majesty, I am nearly concerned in this matter, by reason of a controversy betwixt me and some other in Cambridge, upon a proposition which I there delivered; namely, that whosoever (though before justified) did commit any grievous sin, as adultery, murder, &c., do become *ipso facto* subject to God's wrath, and guilty of damnation, *quoad praesentem statum*, until they repent. Yet, so that those who are justified according to the purpose of God's election, (though they might fall into grievous sin, and thereby into the present state of damnation,) never totally or finally fall from justification, but are in time renewed by God's spirit unto a lively faith and repentance. Against this doctrine some did oppose, teaching that persons once truly justified, though falling into grievous sins, remained still in the state of justification, before they actually repented of these sins; yea, and though they never repented of them, through forgetfulness or sudden death, they were justified and saved.

James made clear that he was on the side of this doctrine, which saved the function of the sacramental church, and the seriousness and importance of the actions of men on earth. He said:

> I dislike this doctrine, there being a necessity of conjoining repentance and holiness of life with true faith; and that is hypocrisy, and not justifying faith, which is severed from them. For although predestination and election depend not on any qualities, actions, or works of man which are mutable, but on God's eternal decree, yet such is the necessity of repentance after known sins committed, that without it no reconciliation with God, or remission of sins.

At this definite check, Rainolds abruptly changed the subject to the Puritan complaint that the Catechism was too brief.

I think we may conclude that the history of the Lambeth Articles in fact represents a check to High Calvinism, and thus to the doctrinal bases of Puritanism. It is part of the process by which Puritanism was alienated from the government and society of England. I think it debatable whether the reasons for this alienation lay entirely in the actions and attitudes of the High Church party. It is at least possible to suggest that, without the extremes of High Calvinism forcing it to extremes of High Churchism, the Church of England might not have had to take refuge in such doctrines as the Divine Right of Kings and Bishops, nor to appeal in such a spineless way as it did to Caesar. The doctrines of Hooker contained the bases for a much more moderate political attitude, but the friends of Hooker, like Sandys, who took much the part that Falkland did in a later Parliament, were finally forced to retreat to the citadel defended by the High Church and the monarchy, to save any of the values which they considered basic. The opponents of the Lambeth Articles were in fact defending the idea of toleration and the "reasonable latitude" of the Thirty-Nine Articles, against attacks which were in fact reactionary. That they used reactionary measures in return is, of course, a measure of their lack of vision.

APPENDIX

ANTI-ARMINIAN AND ARMINIAN ASSERTIONS

from William Prynne's Anti-Arminianisme, or, The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme, second edition much enlarged, 1630, pages 71 ff.

ANTI-ARMINIANISME

"The Anti-Arminian orthodox Assertions, now in controversie (which I shall here eveince to be the ancient the undoubted, the established Doctrine of the Church of England) contract themselves into these 7 dogmaticall Conclusions.

1. That God from all eternity, hath by his immutable purpose and Decree, predestinated unto life not all men; not any indefinite, or undetermined,,but onely a certaine select number of particular men, (commonly called, the Elect, invisible true church of Christ:) which number can neither be augmented nor diminished: others hath hee eternally and perpetually reprobated unto death.

2. That the onely mooving or efficient cause of Election, of Predestination unto life, is the meere good pleasure, love, free grace, and mercy of God; not the preconsideration of any foreseene faith, perseverance, good workes, good will, good endeavours, or any other pre-required quality or condition whatsoever in the persons elected.

3. That though sinne be the onely cause of damnation, yet the sole, the primarie cause of Reprobation, or non-election, (that is, why God doth not elect those men that perish: or why he doth passe by this man rather than an other: As he reiected Esau, when he elected Iacob) is the meere free-will and pleasure of God: not the pre-vision, the pre-consideration of any actuall sin, infidelity or finall impenitency in the persons reiected.

4. That there is not any such Free-will, any such universall, or sufficient grace communicated unto all men, whereby they may repent, beleeve, or be saved if they will themselves.

5. That Christ Iesus died sufficiently for al men: (his death being of sufficient intrinsicall merit in itselfe, though not in God's intention, or his Spirits application, to redeeme and save even all mankind;) but primarily, really, and effectually for none but the Elect: for whom alone he hath actually impetrated, effectually obtained remission of sins and life eternall.

6. That the Elect doe alwaies constantly obey, neither doe they, or can they finally or totally resist the inward powerfull, and effectual call or working of Gods spirit in their hearts, in the very act of their Conversion: neither is it in their owne power, to convert, or not convert themselves, at that very instant time when they were converted.

7. That true iustifying, saving faith is proper and peculiar to the Elect alone, who after they are once truely regenrated and ingrafted into Christ by faith, doe alwayes constantly persevere unto the end; and though they sometimes fall through infirmity and grievous sinnes; yet they never fall totally nor finally from the habits, seeds, and state of Grace."

ARMINIANISME

"The whole erronious Doctrine of Arminianisme, (which hath alwayes beene oppugned by the Church of England from the beginning of reformation to this present) may be reduced to these 7 generall Propositions.

1. That there is no absolute, no irrevocable; but onely a conditional, a mutable Decree of Predestination both to life and death: and that, not of any particular persons, but indefinitely of all beleevers, and unbeleevers in the grosse. And that the number of the Elect and Reprobate is not so certaine, but that it may bee either diminished or augmented.

2. That the pre-consideration or foresight of faith perseverance, good workes, and the right use of grace received, are the pre-required conditions; the efficient causes of Election, or Predestination unto life: not Gods free grace, and mercy onely without respect to these as to a cause.

3. That the originall, the impulsive, primarie, and proper cause of Reprobation, (that is, of its Decree, not of its execution; of Non-electing, not of damning some men, or one man rather then another) is only the preconsideration, the pre-vision of infidelity, sin or finall impenitency in the persons reiected; not the meere Free-Will and pleasure of God.

4. That there is an universall, a sufficient grace derived upon al men since the fall of Adam, by vertue of which they may all repent, beleeve, and be saved if they will themselves.

5. That Christ Iesus died alike primarily, & effectually for all men whatsoever, whether Elect or Reprobates: without any speciall intent to save the Elect alone, or any particular persons more than others: with a generall purpose to save all men alike, upon condition of beleeving & applying of his death: which is suspended principally on every mans owne actuall will and power; not on Christ's actuall application of it to them by his spirit.

6. That it is in the very will and power of men, either finally or totally to resist the inward call, the effectuall working of Gods Spirit in their hearts, in the very act of their conversion, so that they may at that very instant, and all times else, either withstand, or imbrace their conversion at their pleasure.

7. That true iustifying faith is neither a speciall fruite of election, nor yet proper unto the Elect alone; that it is ofttimes found in Reprobates: and that the very Elect by falling into sinne, may; yea, and of-times doe, fall totally and finally from the very habits, seeds, and state of Grace."

CHAPTER FIVE

DUTCH AND ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

The closeness of Dutch and English relationships, commercial, political, and intellectual, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries would seem to indicate that there should have been a connection in their beginnings between the attacks on Calvinistic predestination in the Netherlands and in England. Indeed, this is the assumption upon which most authorities have proceeded.[1] It is true that close connections and influences can be shown in almost every field. But the one exception is, for my purposes, the important one. Before the visit of Grotius to England, the only example of Dutch influence on Anglican theology that I have discovered is Richard Thomson, whose liberal views may have been the result of his upbringing in Holland and his sojourn at Leyden. But his only theological work on the Protestant questions was not published until 1617. Other than what he could do by his teaching, as a fellow of Clare Hall in Cambridge, the formation of English Arminianism was English work. The effect of Dutch Arminianism was considerable in the later development of English lay thought; it was, notably, one important source of the Latitudinarians' and the Cambridge Platonists' theological departures, but theologically the early traffic between the Netherlands and England was a monopoly of the Puritan side of the English division. The Puritans felt themselves to be a part of an international movement; their attempt was from the beginning to bring the Reformation in England into line with European developments. From the days of the Marian exile and the vestiarian controversy they sought advice from abroad, and the Low Countries were their refuge from the Establishment whenever they ran foul of the law. It was in the Netherlands that most of the extreme forms of Puritanism, the Congregationalists, the Brownists, the Baptists, had their first organization. Anglicanism, however, grew more insular. With the end of the sixteenth century the leaders of the English Church are men who have never been abroad, for whom English theology, except for the ancient Fathers, is self-sufficient, who insist on their insularity. "I am not," says Montague, in his Appello, "...Arminian, Calvinist, or Lutheran (names of division), but a Christian." Indeed this was one of the Puritan arguments against the Anglicans. When Laud, in his exercise for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in 1604, held that there could be no true church without a bishop, he was attacked by George Abbot because "he cast a bone of contention between the Church of England and the Reformed on the Continent."[1]

---

[1] I have already cited Professor Knappen's assumptions about Peter Baro, in Chapter IV. Ogg's error is even more egregious. He is reading the characteristics of English Arminianism in its later stages into the development of the Remonstrant Church when he says that Arminius proposed, in addition to a modification of the "radical tenets of his Church", "...also the introduction of altars and the beautification of the bare walls of Dutch churches." (David, Ogg, Europe in the Seventeenth Century, fourth edition, London, 1943, p. 414.)

---

[1] Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, I, 607, note 1.

The English Merchant Adventurers were licensed as early as the fifteenth century to manage the trade between England and the Low Countries. Several regiments of English and Scots troops were sent to the Dutch States in the 1580's to aid the Dutch in their fight for independence. In the 1620's there were 68 companies of English troops stationed in the Netherlands, some in almost every town. As I shall show, it is to an English officer that Grotius turns for the facts about the Lambeth Articles. Spenser celebrated the championing of the afflicted sister country by Gloriana's knight Leicester. Marlowe and Donne, as well as Jonson, Tourneur, Chapman, and many others spent some time there. But the congregations that the English troops organized in the Netherlands were Puritan almost without exception.[1] Professor Jordan puts the beginnings of 'intimate contact' between England and the Netherlands about 1580,[2] but the

---

"That reverence for antiquity and the 'Primitive Church', that interest in the Fathers and deference to patristic teaching, which had belonged to the English Reformation from the outset, acquired an increasing sway in a class of minds to which the rigid definitions of Calvinism with its characteristic polity and forms of worship became more and more unattractive. These were disposed to claim for the Anglican church a distinct place in the Church Catholic. They felt a growing willingness to withdraw from the fraternal connection with the Protestant bodies with which the English church under Edward and Elizabeth had been so closely allied." (George Park Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*, New York, 1906, p. 353.) And Richard Thomson writes to Baudius in 1605 (Pattison's *Casaubon*, p. 263 - citing *Baudii Epp.*, p. 514) "Angli nostri studiosi raro peregrinantur, quare mirum non est si pauci ad vos confluunt."

[1] See Raymond P. Stearns, *Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands*, The American Society of Church History, Chicago, 1940. Also W.J.B. Pienaar, *English Influences in Dutch Literature and Justus van Effen as Intermediary*, Cambridge, 1929.

[2] *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*, London, 1932, I, 302.

evidence he cites concerns mutual influences only on lay thought, and on the Puritan side. Hundreds of Englishmen were educated at Franeker in Friesland, and one of the great English Puritan casuists, William Ames, was a professor there. But, although many Englishmen also attended Leyden University, the home of Arminianism, they do not seem to have brought home its theological influence until later.[1] One of those who went to Leyden was Stephen Goffe, whom Laud tried to use to reduce the Puritan English congregations to conformity in the 1630's, but that is a late development for the purposes of this thesis.

Professor Jordan points out:

> Without doubt the great increase in Continental travel by Englishmen during the reign of Elizabeth did much to break down English prejudice and bigotry, especially against the Roman Catholics. The wider outlook which travel inspired and the observation of nations living commendably under different ecclesiastical and dogmatic systems served to introduce an element of 'relativism' into English religious life. The intimate contact with the Netherlands which began about 1580 had its fruit in the next reign in the Arminian controversy.

It is true that the so-called 'Arminian controversy' or "Quinquarticular controversy" in England was the fruit of the outbreaks in the Netherlands, but it was actually in

---

[1] King James' second letter to the Estates General about Vorstius (October 6, 1611) notes that unless Vorstius is removed as professor at Leyden he will be compelled to tall the young men of his realm that they will be prohibited from attending the university. And in his Declaration (London, 1612) he gives the protection of the young men from England who attended the University of Leyden, as one of the three reasons why he felt he had to act against Vorstius. See below, Chapter VI.

England a continuation of another controversy which had formed part of the whole development of Anglicanism. The real fruit that it bore in England was in encouraging High Calvinists to redouble their efforts to force a narrow High Calvinist dogma on the English Church. This, I should say, was far from a relativistic effect. It was only insofar as their efforts produced more sympathizers with the Dutch Arminians, and thus more resistance to the High Calvinist dogmatists, that Dutch Arminianism affected English Arminianism before 1630. Heylyn, in noting the increase in the strength of the anti-Calvinists in England during the reign of James, says:

> Towards which increase the differences betwixt the Remonstrants and the Counter-Remonstrants in the Belgick Provinces did not help a little, who publishing their discourse one against the other, sharpened the Appetite of many Students in both Universities to feed more heartily on such Dishes as were now plentifully set before them. [1]

The part that lay thought played in English Arminianism is a small one. Many of its sources, its rationalistic twist, for example, lie in Dutch Arminianism, but they too were rooted even more firmly in English tradition. The doctrinal core of English Arminianism is Enlgish theology. It is of course an indication of how close the relationship was between the two countries that 'Arminianism' was the term eventually applied by the Puritans to the doctrinal reform of the English church, but it is an indication that obtains only for those who used it, and the Anglicans did not use it. Since most of those who would be professionally interested in doctrine who went to the Low Countries were Puritans, what they brought back was Calvinistic. And the lay mind has little or nothing to do with the formation of Anglican doctrine in the seventeenth century. The extent to which Dutch Arminianism influenced English lay thought has been best put by Professor Jordan.

---

[1] Quinquarticular History, p. 631.

> Though English lay thought had its roots in the English religious problems of the age, and though it addressed itself primarily to the solution of those problems, it was profoundly influenced throughout the first half of the century by religious developments in Holland. In few periods in English history has thought been so vitally affected by ideas and occurrences in a foreign country. Not only were there hundreds of highly articulate Englishmen resident in Holland as religious exiles throughout the period under consideration; not only was there the bond of close affinity, especially during the reign of James I, between beleaguered orthodoxy in the two countries, but there was, at the same time, the closest cultural and religious contact. Englishmen regarded Holland as the laboratory where the problems of diversity and liberalism in relation to orthodoxy were being worked out somewhat in advance of English developments, and the religious and intellectual history of Holland was followed with absorbing interest by all groups in England. For this reason the momentous Arminian controversy was regarded by Englishmen as almost a domestic problem, and it aroused in England reactions and currents of thought which were to be of the greatest importance. Upon no group in England did these Dutch developments have a greater influence than upon the Moderates. 1

I have already touched on the qualifications that I feel must be made about such a statement as this. To assume,

---

1 II, 319.

first of all, as Professor Jordan's book seems to do, that lay thought is the most important element in history is, especially for the seventeenth century, a dangerous one. The earliest results of Dutch Arminianism in England are seen in the Latitudinarians, and how moderate they were in the sense of rational neutrality can be seen from the fact that they were the allies of, and (some of them) spies for, Laud, and fought for the King. The fact that Professor Jordan was perhaps quite justified in ignoring because of the nature of his subject, is that while philosophic thought was being vitally affected by events in Holland, England had already modified Calvinism in her own way some years earlier. It was the Puritans and such doctrinal heteroclites as James who regarded the Dutch developments as a domestic problem. I shall show that Grotius' mission to England failed of any effect simply because those in England who agreed with him most closely in doctrine would not come to feel that the Remonstrants' battle was their battle.

Because Professor Jordan has taken almost all his evidence from Puritan or lay sources, his ignoring of the proportions of the independent English modification of Calvinism leads him not only to deny the name 'Arminian' to the English development, but also to deny that it is a true continuation of Anglicanism.[1] He insists that its principal characteristics are a break with Anglicanism, and a sharp move toward Rome. He finds it preferable to call it the Anglo-Catholic party. Perhaps it will be better to cite his reasons for this change of nomenclature at length.

---

[1] This judgment seems to depend upon an unspecified and unusual definition of Anglicanism. If one defines Anglicanism in terms of Hooker and Andrewes, it is hard

> It is difficult to find a name for the party which describes it accurately. As we have indicated it is certainly not Arminian, and its leaders disliked and disavowed the title. And, we shall undertake to show, it was not Anglican in the historical meaning of the term. It has occasionally been described as 'Laudian' but this term would seem to limit it too narrowly and to deny to it the fairly large place which it came to hold in English thought. We have, with considerable misgivings, described the group as 'Anglo-Catholic', a term which, it would seem, most accurately denominates the general religious philosophy of the party. It should be understood that no association, organic or otherwise, is implied to exist with either nineteenth-century or contemporary Anglo-Catholicism, though the latter group apparently tends to find, in some particulars at least, precedents for its thought in the writings of the seventeenth-century party. 1

If you are defining Arminianism in terms of religous toleration, it is obvious that, since the party of Laud was notoriously intolerant, it is a misnomer to call it Arminian.

---

to deny, even from Dr. Jordan's point of view, that the church of Laud was closer to being Anglican than what the Puritans wanted to put in its place. And a close study of Hooker and the men upon whom this thesis is focussed is enough at least to cast serious doubt on the accuracy of the claim Professor Jordan advances later (p. 116) that: "The liberalizing of Protestant dogma in England was a contribution, not of the Anglo-Catholics, but of the dissenters." It may not have been the work of the Anglo-Catholics because by their time the liberalization had been accomplished within the church long before the dissenters had been heard in any influential way.

[1] Jordan, II, 115, note.

But if you define it in theological terms, which is the way the seventeenth century had a habit of doing, it is hard to find any other name for it.

Professor Jordan undertakes to show that it 'was not Anglican in the historical meaning of the term' by a series of subjective judgments, which are, to say the least, controversial. "The Anglo-Catholic party," he says, "undertook to deny the historical fact that the Elizabethan Settlement was Protestant in character and that the Church had been, thus far at least, Calvinistic in its doctrinal teachings." The fact is that the originators of the party emphasized the Protestantism of the Anglican communion as much as any other point. And that the Church had always been necessarily Calvinistic in its doctrinal teachings (at least as the High Calvinists defined the Calvinistic doctrine) was a matter in doubt as much to the High Calvinists at the time of the Lambeth Articles as to the theological founders of the Arminian party. To say that "The leaders of the party leaned as far as they could towards Rome without bursting the constitutional framework of the Church", and that, in denying the High Calvinist doctrine of predestination, "...they aimed not so much at a liberalizing of Protestant dogma as at an elimination of one of the chief doctrinal differences which separated Protestantism from Rome", is merely to repeat the charges of Prynne. No member of this party ever confessed that this was their purpose, and the only evidence adduced to prove it was first, the Anglican denial that the doctrine that the Pope was necessarily Antichrist was an article of faith necessary to salvation, and second, the Anglican willingness to admit that the Church of Rome was a true Church, although in many ways corrupt. Both of these positions began with Hooker. We should beware of accepting such accusations. Dr. Jordan ignores facts when he accuses them in addition[1] of attempting "to modify an ecclesiastical structure which was now two generations old...." It has always been admitted, even by the Puritans, that from the beginning it was the Puritans who took the offensive in attempting to modify the ecclesiastical structure to conform to the most extreme implications of the accepted Calvinism of the Church of England. The Arminians, in fact, had an excellent argument in their claim that the ecclesiastical structure that the Puritans had accepted and lived under for two generations, demanded rather a theology like theirs, of conditional predestination and free-will. The Puritan-Anglican controversy may be seen as the contest of a theology seeking to make a polity, against a polity seeking to make a theology.

To accept such a limited and partisan definition of English Arminianism is to fail to account for much of the real complexity and tragedy of the English seventeenth-century struggle. It is to ignore the fact that the Moderates of Dr. Jordan's allegiance were so far from being destroyed by the Anglo-Catholic party (if we think of the Latitudinarians as the most vocal and influential of the Moderates) that their alliance with Laud and the Arminians was not a last resort, but close and constant.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 117.

I have summarized some definitions of Arminianism in an earlier chapter, however. What I offer here is merely a rapid comparison of Arminianism in Holland and in England, for what it will reveal of their similarities and differences.

There are many differences, despite the basic similarities of theological beginnings. The English Arminians are High Church, suspicious of unbridled reason, Monarchist, and they believe in the validity and function of dogma.[1] The Dutch Arminians are suspicious of the power of churches, rationalistic, aristocratic, and anti-dogmatic. On closer examination certain similar forces, altered perhaps by the terms of political history and social development, appear to be working in both toward roughly the same ends. Perhaps the best accounting for the differences is in that historical cliché, British pragmatism. In England the seemingly blind development of the ecclesiastical institution produces a theology which is similar in many ways to that developed in Holland by a deliberate, rational formulation.

---

[1] In fact, in church organization, which is what is emphasized most in England, the Remonstrants had no link with the English at all. The Ioynt Attestation...written by the emissaries to the Synod of Dort in 1626, says (p. 5): "...in the Netherlands, the party opposite unto that Synode, and most aggrieved with the Conclusions thereof concerning the Points controverted, are notwithstanding as vehement and resolute maintainers of the Ministeriall Parity, as any that concluded, or accepted the judgement of that Synode." It may perhaps be said that what kept the two similar theologies from recognizing their kinship was exactly this.

When in 1591 Oldenbarnevelt convoked a committee of eight clerics and eight laymen to draw up a form of church government in which the choice of ministers, elders, and deacons would be a joint responsibility of the lay and clerical elements in the local churches, he was attacked by the extremists on both sides and the arrangement was never accepted. (See Harrison, p. 31.) In general, however, church government was never an item of controversy in the Netherlands, which may account for its becoming a trap for Grotius.

In Holland, then, Arminianism is a purely intellectual movement.[1] Arminius imagines at the beginning that he can keep his differences with the High Calvinists within the brotherhood of the church, and he is surprised and aggrieved when it becomes a political issue. He himself shows a rationalistic idealism in his trust in the power of the truth to carry his points and convince his opponents. Grotius shows much the same confidence. In England, the total change in doctrine comes about slowly under the force of the development of the Church as an institution, which is demanded by adaptation to a social theory on which the monarchy rested. It is a product of tradition. In Dutch Arminianism we have a clean and intentional break with tradition. It is significant that while Arminius was in the early days of his preparation an ardent Ramist,[2] only Baro, among the English Arminians, has any good word for Ramus.[3] They are all in the tradition of Aristotle and Aquinas.

---

[1] Dr. Jordan notes (II, 321) that Dutch Arminianism was an "academic" protest against the doctrine of absolute predestination.

[2] See Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism, p. 21. While a student at Geneva, Arminius gave lessons in his room on Ramist logic, and when this was forbidden at Geneva he went to Basle for a time.

[3] Baro hails Ramus, in his thesis appended to his Praelectiones, as the man who has solved the paradox between necessity and the freedom of the will. But Hooker does not take much stock in "that other new devised aid."

Arminius and his followers never rejected the basic principle of scriptural authority, from which the Calvinists argued, nor did they claim, as did the English theologians, that the Fathers and the traditions of the church[1] could also be used as authorities. The Fathers and the ancient church become the very basis of English doctrine, almost equal in authority to the Bible.

The element that commentators have seized on most for comment in Dutch Arminianism is the fact that it is basically a rationalistic movement, rationalist in a way that goes beyond Calvinism. Professor Randall says:

> Because Reformed Calvinism insisted on a rational interpretation of the Scriptures, because there new sects multiplied most rapidly,...religious rationalism first gained a foothold within its ranks, in seventeenth-century Holland. 2

The claim need not be argued farther than it has already been carried by Tulloch. Faced with the problem of 'saving' God's goodness and omnipotence at once, the Arminians in Holland reject the Calvinistic concept of God as Absolute

---

(Polity, I, vi, 4, Everyman, p. 167.) Professor Miller points out (The New England Mind, p. 314) that Ramist doctrine was identified with Arminian heresy by the Estates General of Holland, although the Aristotelian book of rhetoric which they decreed should be taught in its place, was by Vossius, who was also a Remonstrant, and a close friend of Grotius.

[1] "The Arminian teachers in their recoil from mysticism and their anxiety to guard the liberty of the will, constructed their system on the basis of the formal principle of Protestantism, the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, rather than on the experience of justifying faith." (G.P. Fisher, History of Christian Doctrine, p. 340.)

[2] John Herman Randall, The Making of the Modern Mind, Boston, 1940, p. 283.

Will in favor of a concept of God almost as Absolute Mind. For them, as for Descartes, the intellectual is the central element of consciousness, the ultimate proof of existence. For the early Anglican dealing with rationalism, one need only turn to Sir Thomas Browne's Religio Medici, where the attempt is made to override it. Laud's acceptance of it is by reason of his acceptance of the process of separation, the attempt to accept both the intellectual implications of rationalism and retain the religious validity of sacramental actions. Thus he could insist, with perfect consistency as far as his own synthesis was concerned, that outward conformity was valid by itself, whether intellectual belief accompanied it or not. It was thus impossible for him to see that his insistence on conformity was unreasonable.

Essentially, Dutch Arminianism had a faith in reason that the founders of English Arminianism, of the second generation at least, Donne and Andrewes, would have found ingenuous. Donne's wrestling with the problem is too familiar to enter into here.[1] Where the Arminians, both Arminius himself, and Grotius, and Episcopius assumed that reason could operate in a controlling fashion to produce truth, the Anglican attitude may be summed up in terms close to those used by Shakespeare in Measure for Measure to denominate the validity to be attached to rational processes. His reference there is to "those, that lawlesse and incertaine thought/ Imagine howling."[1] This faith in reason was to come to England in full flower, and it was to make an alliance with the Arminians there, but the elements of which the doctrines of the Arminians were formed were much more reserved. Thought could be 'lawlesse and incertaine' in England, when it was a thing to stake your life on in Holland.

---

[1] It is superficial to assume, as Professor Spencer did, I may say, that his final position was fideism. The Anglican resolution of this impasse is at once more complicated, and less rationalist, than that term implies.

This difference in attitudes toward reason accounts for the difference between Dutch and English Arminianism which has caused most historians to dismiss the term 'Arminian' for the English party as a misnomer. Toleration was one of the original and prime tenets of the Dutch party; it was even an element prior to the attack on predestination in the thought of D. V. Coornhert, who first inspired Arminius to his revolt. He denounced the systems of both Calvin and Luther as a forcing of conscience.[2] Arminius, engaged in answering these attacks, was himself persuaded, as Milton notes in Areopagitica. Toleration remains an integral feature of Dutch Arminianism. As Dr. Jordan says:

> This revolt was to take the form of an academic protest against the doctrine of absolute predestination, but the animating feature of the movement was a noble insistence upon the philo-

---

[1] Act III, scene i. I do not mean to imply that Shakespeare and his contemporaries did not believe in reason, but I do mean to say that they thought that logical rational processes could lead one astray without the guidance of right reason, which was not necessarily logical.

[2] See Jordan, I, 331-334; also Rufus Jones, Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries, London, 1928, pp. 104 ff.

> sophical right of every man to worship as his conscience dictated. 1

In practice, of course, the Estates General, when they were acting as the Remonstrants wished, was far from tolerant in the broad way that the Remonstrants, out of power, could later argue for. They did pass laws, as I shall show, against the free practice of the High Calvinist religion.

Laudianism has, of course, since the seventeenth century, been taken as synonymous with intolerance, but it is a fact that the intellectual and doctrinal basis of English Arminianism lies in an attack upon certain extensions of dogma, although on a different basis from that of the Dutch. Laudian intolerance was an insistence on outward 'conformity' within a traditional intellectual and doctrinal framework which was itself from the beginning loose and inclusive. I have already demonstrated the operation of this flight from too pervasive dogma in the battle over the Lambeth Articles. It needs no laboring again. It is only with Chillingworth that we get the willingness to throw away dogma altogether as a formulation independent of Scripture, although the apologia for so doing comes from the logical extension of the doctrine of 'things indifferent' which had been the basis of Anglican doctrine from the beginning. But the very beginning of Arminianism in Holland is furnished with this suspicion of all creeds, and with a policy of

---

1 II, 321.

overt attack on all formulated dogma as such.[1] For the Remonstrants the idea of dogma reverts to what it was before Christianity joined to doctrine the idea of the state as the repository and enforcer of belief in a particular doctrine: the Greek δόγμα which was merely the embodiment of the tenets of a school of philosophy.

The thing that has made many historians shy away from identification of Dutch and English Arminianism in any terms at all is of course the fact that Dutch Arminianism was Erastian from the beginning, while English Laudianism was anything but that. Professor Jordan says:

> ...the Arminian party in its desperate struggle against orthodox intolerance had appealed to the State on a frankly Erastian basis to intervene in the religious strife which threatened to engulf the United Provinces. The Erastian position as developed by Episcopius, Grotius, and Althusius was very rapidly expanded far beyond the narrow considerations of Erastus. These thinkers called upon the State so to order religious life and worship that protection might be afforded to all Christian communions. The Arminian development of the doctrine was cut short by the 'Erastian' decision of the Govern-

---

[1] Tulloch points out that "The preface to the Remonstrant Confession, drawn up after the Synod of Dort, is little else than an elaborate apology for the very idea of a new confession; and the apologist only succeeds in his object by virtually abandoning the principle of confessions altogether." (I, 24). Here perhaps is the explanation for the fact that Weber and Troeltsch are misled in their conclusions about the relation of dogma and action in England. On the Continent, dogma is far more likely to be the well-spring of action, and the flight from dogma is a deliberate rational act. In the misty English intellectual atmosphere, opposites merge into each other, and what is highly illogical in intellectual terms on the Continent is the very logic of development in England. Thus the High Church men who should be the last defenders of dogma, in England lead the flight from it in the seventeenth century, while the Puritans are its last great defenders!

> ment to intervene in the interests of orthodoxy, and Erastianism in its seventeenth-century meaning was to receive its classical development in England. 1

It was the Dutch statement of the principle which attracted the moderates in England, who took over the direction of the Commonwealth side of the Civil War when the Presbyterians, who had forced things to the point of open conflict, proved incapable of organizing victory. The policy of Elizabeth had always had, as Professor Jordan points out, the support of the Erastians, and the Crown only lost it when Laud and Charles imposed their 'positive Erastian program'. It was, however, the dogmatic offensive of the orthodox Presbyterians which forced resort to such a positive program. In the Netherlands, the Calvinists were in more unchallenged domination of the Church when the quarrel broke out, and the outbreak of theological dispute precipitated their move to take over the state. In England, where the Calvinists had first to make their control of the Church secure, their first moves brought on a revision of the accepted theology, and they were kept busy fighting the theological battle which had already been won by the church in the Netherlands. Thus it was the moderate theology which took possession of the State in England, and the Calvinists who had to fight an entrenched power, at a point in the development of their theology which was already beyond that where they could hold their party to-

---

1 II, 455. But only, of course, after the respective policies of both Laud and the Presbyterians had failed.

gether very long solely on issues of doctrine. Nevertheless, the struggle in both countries was that of the central government against a determined minority. James was to bring Grotius' mission to defeat because he would not admit that the state had as much power in religious affairs as the Remonstrants wanted to give it, but, faced with the same sort of situation later on, the solution that Charles and Laud chose was to increase the power of the state in religious affairs, and it brought their downfall too. In both situations the central government had to face the orthodox theory, adopted by political necessity, and not by any doctrinal desire, that denied that the church was dependent upon the state.[1]

Thus both English and Dutch Arminianism carry similar terms in their inception: the denial of absolute predestination, an attack on dogma the foundation of which is for a certain period roughly the same: a distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals in religion. Both at one stage or another could admit the doctrine of the divine right of the ruler. The difference came in the fact that in Holland the Calvinists succeeded in capturing the state, since they already had possession of the church, and the Remonstrants could dispense with the burden of having to make theory work in political practice, and thus could carry their theories much farther. In England the battle for the Church was in doubt long enough for the Calvinists to be rendered unable to take over the State, when they succeeded in precipitating a war for dogma. It was the retention by the English monarchy and society of the form and framework of the sacramental church which, in the final analysis, accounts for the difference.

---

[1] Douglas Nobbs, in Theocracy and Toleration, (Cambridge University Press, 1938) has made a study of the political theory involved in the events of this period in Holland. He points out that the Arminians' theory of toleration was arrived at gradually. The theory of the relations between Church and State was formulated by four writers, and from four points of view. Arminius had no part in it since he died early in the development of the dispute, and he was always confused in the presence of the political problems stirred up by his doctrines. Its earliest form was in the writings of Uitenbogaert, where it remained largely a theological conception. With Vossius it developed into a doctrine of the divine right of the ruler. Grotius saw the legalistic concept of sovereignty as more important, that the state was bound to preserve its sovereignty against the claims of doctrines. It is only with Episcopius that we get a theory of toleration which demanded the toleration of private churches alongside a state church. It is notable that it is Episcopius who is leader of the Remonstrants when they are driven out and suppressed by the state. Arminianism showed no great signs of developing a theory of toleration when it was in the saddle.

Arminianism in Holland and in England also represented roughly similar divisions of the population. The King's party in the English Civil War represented the remains of the feudal nobility from the areas where commercialization and industrialization had made the least headway, allied with the lower classes.[1] Parliament enlisted the nobility which had a stake in trade or commerce, and the upper and lower middle class.[2] In Holland the division was roughly similar, except that feudalism was farther behind the Dutch, there were many fewer nobility, and the lower classes had had a longer time to lose the effects of any feudal loyalties they might have retained. The Remonstrants included many of the richest and most powerful merchants, and almost all the largest cities, with the exception of Amsterdam.[1] But the classes from which the English Arminians could and did draw the men as well as the means to fight a war were completely lacking to the Remonstrants. Motley says:

---

[1] Dr. Krapp has made a careful analysis of this point as part of his argument in Liberal Anglicanism, to which I have referred in my first chapter.

[2] It is here that the importance of the doctrine of predestination enters. Professor Jordan puts it very accu-

> As a rule the population, especially the humbler classes, and a great majority of the preachers were Contra-Remonstrants; the magistrates, the burgher patricians, were Remonstrant.[2]

Finally, to summarize very briefly a point that has material for many chapters, there is a sense in which Dutch and English Arminianism spring from the same impulse. They are both in their inception products, and attempts to perpetuate the values and attitudes, of Christian humanism against the ultra-rationalism of the Puritan Calvinist

---

rately thus: (II, 319) "The doctrine had endowed the middle class, which had embraced it so tenaciously, with a sense of status and a certainty of position which it was unwilling to relinquish without bitter contest."

[1] See Professor Hyma's article to which I have already referred: "Calvinism and Capitalism in the Netherlands, 1555-1700", *Journal of Modern History*, X (1938), 321 ff. The support for the Remonstrant *Resolution for Peace in the Churches*, which Grotius drew up for the Estates of Holland in 1613, came from the nobles and the representatives from the leading cities. Winwood, in his second address to the Estates General, November 5th, 1611, recognizes this support. He says: "You may yourselves judge the danger to which your state is subjected if the heresy of Arminius is permitted to be accepted by the majority of the citizens in your big towns...."

[2] John Lothrop Motley, *The Life and Death of John of Barneveld*, two volumes, New York, 1874, I, 339.

doctrine. The moral basis of the criticism Arminius launches against High Calvinism is the same as that from which Baro, Hooker, and Andrewes argue. They all accuse the High Calvinists of making God the author of sin. Arminius finished his education with a walking tour in Italy with Junius near the end of the sixteenth century.[1] He was of the intellectual heritage of Erasmus. Hooker and Arminius both drew on themselves the fire of the High Calvinists by affirming that there was no reason why the virtuous heathen should not be saved.

These general observations must remain suggestions only, for the time being. It remains to examine a situation in which Dutch Arminianism came into contact with English Arminianism, and the results of that contact. This I shall proceed to describe in my next chapter, on Grotius in England.

---

[1] He studied for a time at Padua, under Giacomo Zabarella (1533-1589) who is described as "The greatest representative of the Aristotelian School of the Cinquecento", but who was also notably free in his thought, and refused to belong to any school.

APPENDIX

The doctrinal differences between the Arminians in the Netherlands and in England were defined by Grotius in a letter he wrote to Uitenbogaert on June 8, 1614. His description is worth reproducing. He says (Molhuysen, p. 325, No. 348):

"English theologians think diversely on predestination, so that some plainly stand by the Remonstrants, some the Counter-Remonstrants. There are also a third type, who agree with the later sentiment of Augustine, and explain it this way: God, by antecedent will, conditioned and in due order, desires the salvation of individual men, and the benefit of the redemption of Christ pertains to all; also there is no one to whom are not offered sufficient aids to salvation, but to this conditioned decree they subjoin afterwards an absolute decree: he leads certain men, on account of extraordinary love toward them, by certain and infallible means, which nevertheless do not imply necessity, to salvation. These [theologians] differ from the Remonstrants in one point: the rest state that the death of Christ was for individuals, from his and the Father's intention; Grace is resistible; justifying faith [can be] lost; [any] man is uncertain of his own predestination. These, since I know them to be a great number, and that they agree with the Remonstrants in most things I do not wish to offend...." He goes on to suggest changes in the document which they are apparently preparing.

CHAPTER SIX

HUGO GROTIUS AND ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

The influence of Hugo Grotius played a larger part in the growth of English Arminianism than has yet been recognized. The large body of new evidence on the career and thought of Grotius which has come to light during the twentieth century has not yet been sufficiently evaluated and discussed from the standpoint of English theological affairs, although it has been assessed from the point of view of the history of the Netherlands and of the political history of England.[1] What Grotius did was essentially to bring the theologians and churchmen who made up the Arminian party in England under James to a consciousness of the political issues of their theology, during a short period of violent international political maneuver within the pale of Protestantism, and to a consciousness of the possibilities of suppression and popular inundation of the Church which might develop if the Calvinists in England were allowed to unleash and use the forces which the Calvinists in the Low Countries had been able to use. It may have to be said with caution, and only from circumstantial evidence, but the revelation of the issues that Grotius forced upon the English Churchmen at the time of his visit to England was not lost,we can be sure, upon the younger churchmen who looked to Andrewes and Overall as their leaders. The significance of what finally happened to the Dutch Arminians when Grotius proved unable ~~[illegible]~~ to swing James away from his policy of intervention on the side of Maurice and the Counter-Remonstrants, cannot have been hidden from the younger bishops like Montague and Bilson, Cosin and Laud.[1] The fact that the Calvinists (who, even James at one time agreed, were the same as the English Puritans) had been able to take over the government of the Netherlands in the name of the highest of High Calvinism and put all liberal theology and theologians to flight, was a strong argument that the same thing could happen in England. It must have been a strong inducement for them to concentrate upon the political defence of the Church of England by allying themselves with the King and making his power absolute, to checkmate the fierce and narrow theology which embodied itself in the popular political forces. Certainly it is about this time that we have the beginnings of the feeling among the Arminians that there is room for only one theology within the Church of England. Before this time it has been the Calvinists who have insisted that the latitude of the Articles be restricted. Overall, Andrewes and Whitgift had given all their attention to keeping both sides within the Church.

---

[1] Molhuysen's two volumes of Grotius' correspondence, to which I have already referred, is the prime source, which W.S.M. Knight did not have available when he wrote his Life and Works of Hugo Grotius, London, 1925. I have had the good fortune to have the inestimable aid of the typescript of a book by Professor Albert E. Hyma of the University of Michigan on The Life of Hugo Grotius, which has supplied me with many facts and sources which would otherwise have been beyond my reach. The extent of my indebtedness will be apparent in the pages which follow, and yet I think that my researches have added something to the knowledge of the theological and political background to which Grotius came.

---

[1] Montague was engaged by Casaubon to carry Grotius' case to James on one occasion, and in 1621 John Cosin wrote to Grotius, to return to him a book which Overall, who had died, had entrusted to him to give to Grotius when the latter should be released from prison. He comments there on what an impression Overall's sorrow at the development of events in the Low Countries had made on him, and, while he speaks throughout in personal terms, one can be sure that the political dimension was not lost on him. (Molhuysen, II, 99-101, No. 660, June 30, 1621). (Montague's mission to James is referred to in Molhuysen, I, 233, No. 261; it was in 1613).

From the evidence in my preceding chapters it can be seen that A. W. Harrison's conclusion about Grotius and English Arminianism is not true. He has said:

> Unsuccessful though Grotius was in his main object, it is from this period that we begin to discern the first glimmerings of an English Arminian school of thought. 1

The truth is that if Grotius had been the one to bring the first glimmerings of Arminianism to England, he would have had less success than he did. He did, in fact, have an early success, which he threw away by an imprudent act that seems to have been the result of his intellectual brilliance and political immaturity, but he would have had none at all had there not been already in existence a school of English Arminians, the beginnings of which we have already examined. His trouble lay in the fact that they were more English than Arminian, and in the personality and limitations of King James. But it is true that Grotius stimulated a forced growth in this party's self-

---

1 The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort, p. 203.

consciousness, and that the subsequent sharpening of the politico-theological issues may well have influenced their actions as a party.[1]

The least that can be said is that the result of the Arminian disturbances in Holland, and, more directly, of the visit of Grotius to England, was to make the English Arminians more conscious of the differences in doctrine between them and the High Calvinists, to bring the issue to the front, and to inaugurate the final definition of 'Puritan' in terms of doctrine rather than of discipline.

On the other hand, the result for the Puritans, or High Calvinists within the Church, was to make them more aware of the necessity for an international united front of Protestantism and of the fact that only High Calvinism could make that front effective. The growing threat of Spain and the Catholics, within and without, to England and Protestantism, would only heighten their consciousness of the issues. They must have been appalled at the influence that a liberal theology had managed to exert in England, and that at a time when James was working on the Spanish match and lowering the domestic defences against Recusants. Had it not been for the presence of Abbot in the high office of Archbishop, and his effective knowledge of political maneuver, the strength of Dutch Protestantism would in their view have been overthrown, and a great outpost of Protestantism against the inroads of the Papacy would have been lost. For them, Uitenbogaert and Grotius were as much traitors, bought with Spanish gold, as Oldenbarnevelt was for Maurice.

---

[1] I am speaking here, of course, of the policies of the administrators and bishops of the Church. The effect of Dutch Arminianism on lay thought, and on the lower orders of the Church was more overt, and much stronger, and its effect is on the whole rationalistic and in the direction of Deism. But in terms of events and movements this stream of influence is not to have much effect until much later. The extent of that influence must be the subject of another study.

When Grotius came to England in 1613, the Calvinists had already been aroused by the theological struggle in Holland, and James had already aligned himself and the political influence of England with the Counter-Remonstrants, although he had also shown signs of withdrawing somewhat from his early advanced position. The occasion had been the election of Conrad Vorstius to succeed Arminius in the chair of theology at the University of Leyden. The evidence seems to point to the fact that the English Arminians, although they had taken academic notice of the struggle in Holland,[1] had not identified themselves with the Remonstrants or taken their part in any way. Their indifference in the face of their known influence with James was, in fact, the reason for Grotius' mission. Their effort had been to continue their attempts to keep the questions in England out of the area of theology and in the realm of discipline, where they could be at one with the objections James had to the power in religious affairs that the Remonstrants wanted to give to the magistrate. Overall insists before Grotius' visit that the English Church holds a "mediam viam" between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants; Andrewes tries almost ludicrously to keep from reading and giving James his opinion on a book Grotius sends him through Overall. After the death of Casaubon, it is only Overall with whom Grotius corresponds in England. There are no letters extant between him and Andrewes, and it is apparent from the way that Overall carries messages between Grotius and Andrewes that there never were any written. Andrewes insisted to Sir Dudley Carleton that he had been misrepresented as favoring the Remonstrants, and expressed great indignation to Abbot at Grotius' using his name in Holland.

---

[1] I have cited above Overall's De statu questionum quinque inter Remonstrantes et Contra-Remonstrantes Controversarum (St. John's College Cambridge MS. H. 15, pp. 4-7, photostatically reproduced with Miss Overall's thesis.) The difference between the tone of cool neutrality here, and the warm sympathy in his letters to Grotius during and after the latter's visit to England makes me think that his is an early production, and that Grotius was able to convince Overall that there was not so much difference between the Remonstrants' and Overall's theological positions as he had thought. The evidence for this point will emerge more fully as this chapter continues.

I am sure that this was not done by Andrewes to save his political skin and his place of preferment and power. It can be easily demonstrated that Overall's continued correspondence with Grotius was politically naive. Andrewes believed strongly that nothing was accomplished for the interests of true religion by theological hair-splitting; he insisted on confining the teaching of the Church to the great basic truths of Christianity.[1] In addition, they were a small band still, and even more on the defensive after Abbot succeeded to the Archbishopric in 1611. They must tread carefully. They were aware that James professed to be a High Calvinist, and that he assumed that if the clergy were not, they must not deal with the questions on which they differed with the High Calvinists. Having seen the violent swings that James' policy and actions took in the affair of the Netherlands' theological quarrels, it may well have seemed to them that they would sacrifice more, not only in personal power, but also in the peace of the whole realm and the interests of the Church of England, if they attempted to make their influence tell in behalf of the Remonstrants. Finally, most of those who held liberal theological doctrines may not have been aware of their kinship with the Remonstrants, since the bases of the English revolt from Calvin had been, as we have seen in the last chapter, differently motivated. One of the reasons for Grotius' final failure was that he did not recognize this fact.

---

[1] See his comments on the Lambeth Articles, above, Chapter IV, pp. 198-199.

James began by a violent attack on Vorstius and by identification of the latter's theological views with the Arminians'; then when the Estates General had finally danced to his tune, he admitted that the question of Vorstius was entirely separate from the question of predestination, which was, after all, a "thing indifferent", and that the Remonstrants had his complete support in going ahead with the settlement they contemplated; then he swung back again to violent opposition to the Remonstrants and to support of Maurice in his attempt to wipe them out. These vagaries of James' policy are a chart of the immediate effect of Grotius' mission upon political events. Grotius had a preliminary success. He succeeded in divorcing the affair of Vorstius from the whole theological and political issue of Arminianism, and persuaded James that the question of predestination should not affect policy. In this James was not inconsistent, for this had been the basis of Anglican policy from the days of Whitgift and Hooker, and, as I have shown, this was James' reason for rejecting the Puritan demand at Hampton Court that the Lambeth Articles be included in the Thirty-Nine. James gets his record for inconsistency in this affair from the fact that in his early communications to the Estates General on the subject of Vorstius, he specifically links the heresies of Vorstius with the more widespread heresy of Arminius. When Oldenbarnevelt and the States accede to his demand, James throws the Counter-Remonstrants into consternation by announcing that the affair is closed and, incidentally, that the Arminian heresy is no longer a heresy. This James had already done before Grotius arrived in England, but it was a letter, probably prepared at least in part by Grotius and presented to James by Noel Caron the Dutch Ambassador, which had convinced him. It seems evident (despite the evidence of Abbot to the contrary)[1] that Grotius' interviews with James confirmed him in this policy. For if Grotius had not been so impressed by the apparent firmness of the king in his intentions of following this policy, he would hardly have gone back to Holland and joined in advising measures which turned out to be as foolhardy and dangerous as they did. Grotius counted too much on the support of Overall, Casaubon, and Andrewes, and he did not realize how James could reverse himself. He flattered himself that, once convinced by him, James would never return to his former policy. So he did the incredibly foolhardy thing of writing the Ordinum Pietas on his return to Holland. This little book most naively reiterated the Remonstrant defence of Vorstius, and rejoined the two questions, the divorce of which had been the key to salvation for the Remonstrants and the whole leadership of Oldenbarnevelt. It accused the attackers of Vorstius of impiety, and by implication confirmed for James all that Abbot could tell him, that the heresy of the Arminians was inseparable from the Socinianism of Vorstius. This move cost Oldenbarnevelt his head, and Grotius his country.[1]

---

[1] See Molhuysen's comments on Knight's accepting the verdict of Abbot on Grotius, Briefwisseling, I, xxiv.

---

[1] This action of Grotius' remains a puzzle. Molhuysen claims that Grotius realized that his mission had failed, and that he had no chance of holding James favorable to the Remonstrants, and that he had given up English support as lost when he wrote the Ordinum. But this contradicts what Grotius says in his reports from England, and his letters to Overall and Casaubon. To my mind this only proves his amazing naiveté, and his over-confidence in the success of his mission and the power of his friends with the King. I shall summarize the full facts in their place below.

James' sentiments about the question of predestination's belonging to the category of "things indifferent" did not altogether leave him, however; political events were driving him toward political Arminianism. His instructions to the English deputies to the Synod of Dort[1] show that his intentions there, checkmated though they were by the power of the High Calvinists who had now gone too far to be called back, even by the man who had made their political triumph possible, was to throw English influence into the scales against making the tenets of absolute predestination and reprobation a standard for heresy. But, as usual with James' policies, this one had all the effects he did not desire. The fact that he sent a deputation at all (when the French King refused to do so) convinced the High Calvinists that the Church of England and its theology was theirs. This may, of course, have been part of his purpose, for allaying the suspicions roused by his maneuverings with Spain. The fact that he sent them, and the great advantage this gave the Calvinists in politics, must have made even more clear to the English Arminians that their only hope lay in allying themselves firmly enough to the monarch so that they could prevent this sort of thing happening again. The results of the Synod, however, also convinced a large number of moderates, of whom the best-known example is John Hales, not only that the Calvinists were likely to be more tyrannical than Laud, but also that a rational doctrine that would allay the heat of these quarrels was a solution greatly to be desired.

---

[1] See G. P. van Itterzon, "Koning Jacobus I en de synode van Dordrecht", Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, New Series, XIV (1931) 187-204.

I shall document the interpretation I have just outlined in the pages that follow, but for convenience of apprehension I must first summarize more in detail the events in Holland - the rise of Arminian theology and its political repercussions, the effect on Dutch affairs of Grotius' mission - to arrive at my central interest, the effect of Grotius on English events and developments.

The task that Grotius set himself on his mission to England was to swing the balance of English influence away from the Counter-Remonstrants to the side of the Remonstrants. He meant to do this by showing James that the theological position which James had taken, and which he favored in Holland, must necessarily bring his influence (which was decisive) to bear on the side of that party which was diametrically opposed to his political principles. He was, in other words, to show him that the Counter-Remonstrants were Puritans. In this he succeeded in two brilliantly managed interviews. He had in mind also to gain contact with the leaders of the Arminian party in the English Church, to make them realize the theological implications of the political struggle going on in Holland, and to unite them in trying to hold James firm to his new policy. It was a daring plan, and a sweeping one, especially since he had to carry it all out under the camouflage of a diplomatic mission about the affairs of the Dutch and English East India Companies, a mission which also included one member with credentials from Maurice to gain access to James on the part of the Counter-Remonstrants, and bring him around to full support of their side. This man Grotius succeeded in keeping from even having access to the King.

I think that Grotius realized that he was going to be forced literally to "smoke out" the English Churchmen. Archbishop Abbot realized as much, as can be gathered from the phrasing of his letter to Winwood about Grotius. It is apparent that Abbot feared him, and realized by this time the objectives of his mission. The weakness of Grotius' plan was that he was trying to push the English Arminian party into moving the questions between Puritan and Anglican off the plane of discipline and polity and on to the plane of doctrine, and that shift was exactly the one which the Anglican party from the days of the Elizabethan settlement had felt was most dangerous for the interests of the Church. To Grotius, the brilliant young rational humanist, it was unthinkable that you would not have a doctrine that was specific in all terms, and that your parties should not divide according to those doctrines. It did not occur to him that English pragmatic action might find itself able to get along with contradictory creeds in the same church for quite a long time. This is the typical seventeenth-century dynamics of rationalism versus humanistic traditionalism, which is to be played out in philosophy in this same century in the dynamics of Cartesianism versus British pragmatism or realism. It was the acceptance of the necessity of consistency of doctrine and discipline on both sides, by the younger generation of Churchmen, which precipitated the final catastrophe, and who can say how much responsibility Grotius bears for precipitating that final division?

In a tactical sense, of course, Grotius failed. He was able to enlist only Casaubon and Overall; Andrewes stayed clear, especially after Grotius' Ordinum alienated James; intimidated by Abbot and Carleton, he insisted on carrying on his discussion with Grotius second-hand through Overall, in terms of political issues only. But in more long-range terms, as I have explained above, it may well be that his is at least part of the influence that lies behind the vigorous political measures that the Arminians begin to use under the leadership of Laud, even before he comes to the Primacy, which give the term 'English Arminian' its peculiar political overtones to this day.

As long as the war with Spain continued, the theological quarrels raised in the Netherlands by the teachings and writings of Arminius could be kept from having their full political effect. But when Oldenbarnevelt negotiated the truce in 1609,[1] the suspicions roused in Maurice and the Counter-Remonstrants that Oldenbarnevelt had been bought off by Spanish gold were strengthened by the split in theological parties. Arminius had moved with great caution in revealing his views; he had really only come out into the open with a full exposition of them, in writing, in 1608. He had appeared before the full assembly of the Estates General on October 30, 1607 and made a full statement of his principles, and the next month his leading opponent, Gomarus, had also appeared before the same assembly to attack those views for the Counter-Remonstrants.[1] It was then that Arminius felt he had to publish his doctrine in full. His death in 1609 had only intensified the quarrel, since Bertius, the regent of the Theological college at Leyden, whose naïve blunders in political tactics were to plague Grotius later, poured fresh fuel on the flames by the funeral oration he delivered for the dead leader.[2] The theological leadership of the Remonstrants devolved upon Uitenbogaert, while Oldenbarnevelt had already become their political leader.

---

[1] "The truce with Spain marked the opening of a period of theological and political pamphleteering which increased in bitterness and intensity until the Synod of Dort...." (Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism..., p. 138).

Hugo Grotius had taken a somewhat detached interest in the political side of these quarrels from the beginning, and his detachment had extended to the theological issues involved also. He had been much more interested in scholarship and the classics, and his suggestion of Arminius for the chair of theology at Leyden had been made, apparently, because of his admiration for Arminius' scholarship rather than out of any strong attachment to his theology.[1] Professor Hyma says that it was not until he was elected Pensionary of Rotterdam in 1613, and took his seat in the Estates, that he had to deal with these questions in a much more immediate way and became a theologian.[2] It was probably as a scholar paying tribute to another scholar that Grotius too delivered an oration at the funeral of Arminius.[1] He was much surprised that this action and the poem he contributed to the memorial volume that was published afterwards involved him with the testy and terrible Gomarus. We have preserved a letter from Grotius to Gomarus claiming that a misprint of "solus" for "totus" was what had made it appear that Grotius was saying in this poem that Arminius "alone" desired the heavenly kingdom. He professes to be indignant about the mistake himself: "Miror eius" he says, "quicumque is est, audaciam et stupiditatem, qui in alieno opere tam infelicita curiosus fuit." We may well accept his disclaimer here of having any intention of mixing in the doctrinal quarrels which were raging more and more hotly about him:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 108 ff., 113 ff.
[2] Bertius was to be the one who sent the manuscript of the Ordinum Pietas to England before Grotius could revise it, which precipitated the ruin of what Grotius had accomplished in England. He was later to go over to Rome.

---

[1] Harrison says (p. 43): "It was apparently the youthful Hugo de Groot (Grotius), soon to be one of Europe's leading publicists and scholars, who had written to Wtenbogaert, then with the States' Army in Brabant, urging him to sound Arminius on the subject." He does not, however, document this statement. Knight cites the Catholic Encyclopedia as authority for the same statement, and he seems to think that Grotius was a political leader at this time (p. 56), although the facts as revealed by Professor Hyma, who has had access to many more sources than Knight had available, indicate that Grotius was far from prominent in politics at this time (1602). Harrison says that Grotius' taking the side of Arminius dates from his hearing the debate of Arminius and Gomarus before the Estates in 1608 (p. 104). R. W. Lee (Hugo Grotius, Proceedings of the British Academy, XVI, London, 1930) agrees with Professor Hyma that Grotius' interest in theological issues began only with his taking his seat in the Estates. However, it may well be true that Grotius should have backed Arminius simply as a scholar, keenly interested in the standing of the Netherlands and the University of Leyden, with which his connections were very close, in the world of scholarship. On several occasions later in his life Grotius said he took no theological sides in the controversy, since he was no theologian. Since these statements were made to Archbishop Abbot, and to his examiners at the time of his trial, however, we may discount them to a certain extent.

[2] I think it can be detected in a comparison of Grotius' writing before and after his trip to England, that it was that experience that turned him to theology, perhaps unfortunately for his abilities as a politician. He comes to England thinking of his mission in political terms, but his conversations with Overall and Andrewes and Casaubon seem to make him more of a theologian, seeing the doctrinal side as paramount. A good indication of the change is the terms in which he speaks of the Vorstius affair in his first letter to Casaubon, and the fact that he returns to Holland to include a vigorous defence of the

> I had known the man only as I knew many men, and not with any bond of intimate friendship, ...but I always admired in him an uncommon genius and a certain transparent eloquence.... However, as to those questions in which Arminius disagreed with you and many good men, I know little about them; and if I did, I would not rashly intervene. By God's good grace, I think it is allowable to us who are busy with other affairs to remain in ignorance about many things, and to suspend our judgment about others. 2

---

policy he had deplored, in the first thing he writes after his return. It seems that the theological atmosphere of England, upon which he himself commented, proved in the end to be his political undoing.

[1] Molhuysen (I, 156 n) says that Grotius delivered an oration. Other authorities say merely that he contributed a poem to the memorial book.

[2] Translated in Harrison, pp. 129-130. Molhuysen I, 158.

There is every evidence for believing that Grotius is not overstating his detachment. He had been in his youth a boarder at the house of the great Calvinist Junius, when he first entered the University of Leyden in 1594, but his friends thereafter were more among the Remonstrants. He had lived in Uitenbogaert's house on his return from France in 1600, and his relations with him were to continue close all through this period. Although theology and theological modes of thought played as large a part in Grotius' education and process of maturity as in those of any young man of the age, he was one of the humanists for whom theological questions seemed settled, as he devoted himself to classical scholarship. Like Casaubon, he was to be dragged back from the world of the classics to realize that theology was the stuff of politics again, and to be convinced that the solution of theological questions was of the first priority. He comes to his Arminianism by the same channels of scholarship which had led the English Arminians to their position, and Casaubon to his. The course of Grotius' arriving at this interest can be seen in the course of the correspondence between him and Casaubon. The first letter exchanged between them which has survived is written by Casaubon from Paris, July 10, 1602,[1] apparently in reply to a letter from the young Grotius, who had perhaps written to make overtures toward opening one of the scholarly correspondences so popular among, and valuable to, the scholars of the time. Casaubon assures him that he has watched his career like a comet. "Tu vero falleris, clarissime iuvenum, qui eruditissima tua scriptā putas mihi invisa."

---

[1] Printed in Molhuysen, I, 24. Lee's statement that Grotius began "at 16" his exchange of letters with Casaubon "then in England" is an error. W. S. Knight does not supply evidence for his statement (p. 46) that Casaubon first wrote to Grotius congratulating him on his translation of Martianus Capella, which came out in 1600.

Casaubon had just arrived in Paris and was beginning to carry on his scholarship in the face of the Roman influence at the French Court and standing off the attempts of Rome to convert him.[1] The issues had not yet sharpened to the point where he had also to conceal a growing distaste for the intransigeance and scant respect for the Fathers and the traditions of the Church shown by the Calvinists.

In the discussions in 1604 about the confirmation of Casaubon in the post of librarian to Henry IV, the Catholic party in opposing the appointment offered to call in young Grotius from the Hague "...in order to make it appear that the objection to Casaubon was not merely for his protestantism."[2] What they thought to gain by this is hard to fathom. Perhaps Grotius had diplomatically made himself known, during his visit to France with the Dutch mission in 1600, as one whom the Catholics could use. It must have been with complete confidence that Casaubon answered "that if Grotius would be pleased to come, he (Casaubon) would be well pleased to see him there".[3]

---

[1] See Pattison, Isaac Casaubon, Chapter IV.

[2] Ibid., p. 198.

[3] Pattison, in relating the incident, is apparently not aware that Casaubon and Grotius had been in correspondence.

Molhuysen prints another letter to Grotius from Casaubon, which he dates as April 1606.[1] Grotius has apparently again taken the initiative and sent Casaubon a poem he has composed on the death of Beza. Again Casaubon's praise is extravagant. He could hardly keep from tears in the reading, he says, and he rejoices at the thought that such a great man should be praised by such a great poet. Pattison makes clear that such fulsome praise was not always Casaubon's habit, at least in regard to scholarly productions. It may be that he was not so dependable a critic of modern as of ancient literature, or that he was aware, from the mention of Grotius at the time of his appointment as librarian, of the influence the young man might exert. Casaubon goes on in the letter to recall his having known Beza at Geneva, and "...cum tuum carmen iterum atque iterum legenti acrior cogitatio animi mentem subiisset, quantam in uno capite Ecclesia Dei iacturam fecisset; quem tu locum mihi videris elegantissime gravissimeque tractasse." It is a little ironic that these two should be so mourning the man to whose followers in the modification of Calvinism away from its humanist bases they were both to owe so much of persecution and unrest.

Their correspondence is desultory for the next few years. In May 1608, Casaubon writes again, and on April 3, 1610, Grotius writes that he hopes to see Casaubon on his ensuing trip to France.[2] This was apparently the deputation on which Uitenbogaert met Casaubon, but there is no record that Grotius went along. Meanwhile the pressure from the Roman Catholics for Casaubon's conversion had grown stronger, and the sharpening of the dissension within the Protestant ranks in the Netherlands was affecting the solidity of what Casaubon felt he had to fall back on in resisting this pressure. Pierre du Moulin, who had given up his position at Leyden for what Pattison calls "the ill rewarded and battered life of minister in his native country"[1], felt the disapproval of Casaubon for the weak basis of much of his theological argument in his writings and in his sermons to the congregation at Charenton where Casaubon worshipped. Du Moulin called on Casaubon on one occasion to demand possession of a copy of du Moulin's tract, Defence of King James' confession of faith, in which Casaubon had marked some of the author's errors. The suspicion of his orthodoxy which got abroad was not alleviated, we may suppose, by Casaubon's interview with Uitenbogaert in the spring of 1610, news of which must have been widely spread.[2] Casaubon and Uitenbogaert had been fellow-students at Geneva and now, in their recoil from the extremes of High Calvinism, they were following much the same path. Later on in the same year he expressed the opinion that Arminius was a great man, "though those of our pastors for whom the opinion of Calvin is the norm of truth find him a wicked heretic."[1]

---

[1] I, 66.
[2] Molhuysen I, 165.

---

[1] Page 247.

[2] Although the edition from which Pattison quotes (pp.250 ff.) is dated 1704, he also notes that "The Arminian party valued them for the sake of giving their views the authority of Casaubon's name", it is hard to believe that they would not have used them immediately for propaganda purposes. It may well be that Grotius' knowledge that Casaubon was received and agreed with in England was one of the big reasons for his assuming that the English Church was potentially favorable to the theology of the Remonstrants.

The immediate cause for Casaubon's removal to England was, of course, the assassination of Henry IV which occurred on May 14, 1610. But the move had long been in his thoughts, and while he would not take the step of trying to get away because of Catholic pressure for his conversion, the progressive destruction by the High Calvinists of the ground on which he could stand against the Catholics in France, certainly made him more and more anxious to go. The formal invitation came from Archbishop Bancroft in July, and Casaubon arrived in England on October 29th, just a few days before Bancroft's death. He was received by Overall, and lived with him for the first twelve months he was in England. Overall had been Dean of St. Paul's since 1602. Casaubon was to find in England a more comfortable refuge as far as peace of mind went, but, as Mark Pattison makes clear, he was to be diverted from his scholarship of lasting value to carrying on the theological polemics which defined the bounds of James' interest in scholarship. But this was nevertheless the country "in which, to his surprise, he found a whole national church encamped on the ground on which he had believed himself to be an isolated adventurer."

---

[1] Harrison, p. 145.

Grotius was to write in 1613: "I come from England where there is little commerce of letters; theologians are there the reigning authorities. Casaubon is the only exception; and he could have found no place in England as a man of learning; he was compelled to assume the theologian." Casaubon was brought to England, not only to aid James in his international theological polemics, however, but also as an aid in the internal struggle between Arminian and Puritan. The English Arminians encouraged the project, I have no doubt, not only for the delights they anticipated of converse with one of the great scholars of the world, but also for the additional influence they would get with James. There was no doubt that he had to think about party. Grotius' words about Casaubon, when he looked back in 1639, indicated that he saw Casaubon as an adjunct to a party. He says:

> Of the pieces of good fortune which have befallen me in the course of my life, I reckon it among the chief that I had the regard and affection of that great man, whose piety, honesty, and candour, were not less remarkable than his vast all-embracing erudition. I can look back, without sadness, to those times, gloomy as they were, and those trying occasions, in which I guided myself by his counsel, and those of the party which he approved. 1

Andrewes was a prime mover in getting Casaubon to England, and Bancroft had also urged it. However, Casaubon also got along very well with Abbot, who succeeded Bancroft as Archbishop of Canterbury, and with the rest of the High Calvin-

---

1 Pattison, Casaubon, p. 346.

ists. He did not bolster the party directly so much as, by the introduction of Grotius into the scene, he acted as a catalyst.

There is no indication that Grotius had any acquaintance in England except through Casaubon.[1] Casaubon was not the one to bring the theological split that had developed in England to a head, but Grotius was, aided, of course, by the development of political events. Pattison's comparison of the two makes use of the conventional view of Grotius as primarily interested in law and politics; Knight and Hyma have shown, however, that his theological interest, which had begun to grow before his trip to England, dominates his thought and intellectual interests in the years that follow. I have outlined, and will shortly document, what Grotius did to England. It seems evident that what England did to Grotius was to convince him that theology was more important than he had thought. This, I think, emerges as the strongest impression from a consideration of the letters connected with

---

[1] There is no evidence that Grotius knew anyone but Casaubon before he went to England. In the answer we have from Bertius to a letter Grotius wrote after his return from England, there is an indication that he felt he needed to know more Englishmen at that time, probably to widen the appeals by letter which he begins to send out to help the situation of the Remonstrants. Bertius writes on September 5th, 1613: (Molhuysen I, 257, No. 279). "Magnorum virorum in Britannia iudicia de me, crebris quidem sermonibus, ad me perlata sunt, sed praeter Saraviam et Casaubonum nemo ad me scripsit. Imo significavit amicus quidam non infimi subsellii, non esse scribendum ad quenquam, nisi si quem periculo illic, mea caussa, expositum vellem. Suspicor amantes mei esse Eliensem, [Andrewes] Lincolniensem, [Neile] Fuldensem, [?] Decanum Londinensem, [Overall] et paucos alios."

Grotius' mission to England, against the background of the whole course of his life. Before he went to England his interests were in scholarship, in literature, in law and politics; after he has been to England, he is interested in politics and theology, and especially theology, even after the issues in which his interest began have passed away and he is an exile; that subject grows more and more engrossing to him for the rest of his life. Pattison compares Casaubon and Grotius thus:

> Their point of view was sufficiently like for them to be classed by the historians together among the waverers. Their aim, the reunion of Christendom, was the same. They sought it by different roads; Grotius by the statesman's road of political comprehension; Casaubon, by the theologian's, a merging of minor differences in a common Christianity, on the basis of the primitive centuries. [1]

It is Grotius, however, who suggests the theologian's road, as Pattison defines it here, in his answer to Casaubon's re-opening of their correspondence in his letter from London, December 11, 1611, a little over a year after his arrival in England, when the subject is the re-union of Christendom. Casaubon writes, in this renewal of correspondence, that he has often wished to establish a "commercium literarum" with Grotius, apparently forgetting completely that they had had some correspondence before this.[2] He is taking the opportunity now of sending Grotius a book he has just written, the Epistola ad Frontonem Ducaeum,[1] by the King's order. This is one of the defences of the English church and its leaders, the production of which had been one of James' prime motives in getting Casaubon to England. James is no doubt also intent on using Casaubon's wide acquaintance in international scholarship to bolster the intellectual defences of the English Church. But in the contemporary setting of Dutch-English relations, it has an even greater importance. In ordering Casaubon to begin a correspondence with Grotius, James is, whether he knows it or not, making overtures to a prominent member of a party against whose direction of political affairs he has just powerfully and disturbingly intervened. The project which Casaubon now suggests, and which Grotius eagerly takes up in his prompt answer, dated January 7, 1612, is for the integration of Protestantism under the leadership of James. This idea is almost constantly in James' mind throughout his reign; it is one of the principles which make him an Arminian, for, as we have seen, the theory of the Church and the theology which would admit a sufficient latitude in basic elements of belief to include other Protestants was one of the things for which Baro had been attacked. James added to it of course a liberal helping of personal vanity, and it has been the custom to sneer at his pretensions, but at the time the idea had all the appearance of a practicable plan.[1]

---

[1] Ibid. The claim of Hallam, that Grotius was a waverer before the claims of the Roman Church is as unfounded in the case of Grotius, as Knight and Hyma make clear, as Pattison has proved it to be in the case of Casaubon.

[2] Molhuysen, I, 191.

---

[1] Is. Casauboni ad Frontonem Ducaeum S.J. Theologum epistola, Londini, Norton, 1611, 4to.
There seems to be no doubt of the affirmative answer to the question propounded by Knight (p. 129): "Was it that Casaubon [in opening this correspondence] believed that Grotius had views in relation to Christian unity more or less identical with his own, and, tentatively sending forth this letter, was hopeful that cooperation towards the same end might thereby be established? And was Casaubon, in this essay, acting, not only with the knowledge, but even at the suggestion, or with the encouragement of the King himself?"

Grotius has a dimension to his thought, of course, which Casaubon knows nothing of. Casaubon wants only to be left alone with scholarship; he sees no reason why religious questions should get into politics. Grotius comes to theology by way of law and politics, but he sees it as the underlying and most important element of politics at the time. He comes to think always in terms of their interaction. Thus he thinks that a theological merging of "minor differences in a common Christianity", for the defence of Protestantism, will bring political solutions along with it. But his is not the cynical attitude of the politician, using theology for his manipulative purposes; he believes that in the theological dimension he has hold of the most important one.

At this time, Grotius was already well known in England for his writings on international law, which were providing the arguments for the disputes between England and the Netherlands over fishing rights off the coast of England and the clash of the Dutch and English colonial and commercial claims and activities in the Far East. The Dutch fisheries off the English coast had from time immemorial been the basis of Dutch nourishment and trade; England now wished to deny these fishing grounds to the Dutch, or tax them. Grotius' De Jure Praedae, written in 1604-05, and only recently discovered, had been written in defence of the right of the Dutch East Indian Company to take prizes when some Mennonites within the Company had protested against that policy because of their religious scruples against mixing warfare with commercial activities. This document formed the basis of his book Mare Liberum, on which rests Grotius' claim to being "the father of international law". The claim to freedom of the seas contained in this book was answered by a Scottish professor, Anthony Wellwood in 1613 and later by Selden, and it served the turn of the fisheries dispute for the Dutch. But it was a theory of "Mare Clausum" which he was to defend in the argument with the English over the East Indies affairs of both nations, which was the ostensible reason for his visit to England in 1613.

---

[1] "Nor had he [Gondomar] any doubt that England was the keystone of Protestantism. If the countenance of England were withdrawn from the Protestants on the Continent, the Catholic Princes would be able to resume their legitimate authority. The Dutch rebels would be compelled to submit to their lawful sovereign. The French Huguenots would be unable any longer to make head against the King of France...." Samuel R. Gardiner, History of England, ten volumes, London, 1895, II, 252.

In 1609 James had forbidden all foreigners unlicensed fishing off the English coast or in the Irish Sea, and the deputation which was sent to England from Holland under Elias Barneveld argued for a principle which Knight says

Grotius was probably responsible for framing: that a prince could command only the distance of a cannon-shot from his own shores. James ended by reserving the right he claimed, but at the time forebore to exercise it.

James had given Casaubon blanket instructions to write to all the learned men he knew, but it is only to Grotius, as far as we know, that Casaubon writes about this project of the union of Protestant Christendom.[1] James perhaps did not know that Grotius was a member of the party against which he had just turned his hottest fire. But the English Church, and its monarch too, was by this time used to a two-front war; it was not unusual for violent opponents on one question in both England and Holland to be staunch allies on another, against the common enemy, Rome. It may well be that James was in this way trying to find a means of pushing Protestant interests as a whole, to cover the damage that he must have known was being done by the dissensions that were increasing in violence within the body of Protestantism.

Grotius' prompt reply suggests that the only solution to the great question of unifying the Protestant churches is a General Council to be held in England with James presiding, to draw up a creed upon which all Protestants can agree.[2] Casaubon writes back on the 18th of January that the project has the King's most hearty approval. On the 27th Casaubon, without waiting for a reply, writes about it again. He says there is a possibility that even in France the best men would ally themselves with the Reformation "provided equity and moderate counsels prevail, and the mysteries of the early Church be not despised and ignored. And these mysteries are equally the object of the reverence of the English King and the most learned of the Anglican divines. Many of the English bishops, indeed, are anxiously turning over in their own minds, day and night, ideas substantially the same as those of Grotius."[1]

---

[1] Knight says (p. 131) that Casaubon was instructed by the King to write also to Bertius, Vossius, and Lydius, the minister at Dort, but the subject of these letters seems to have been the theological dissensions in Holland.

[2] Molhuysen, I, 192.

In his reply dated February 7th, Grotius reiterates his suggestion of a General Council, implying that the first move must be made by James, but Casaubon's answer indicates that at the prospect of his taking the initiative, James has now drawn back. Grotius is urged to sound the deputies of the Estates General on the subject.[2] Grotius later claimed that Oldenbarnevelt had known of his correspondence with Casaubon, and it may be that James had found out that Grotius was interested in pushing the project of the Council to draw him off from his energetic interference in Dutch affairs, in which he was now strongly engaged.

---

[1] As paraphrased by Knight, p. 131.

[2] This project of a union of churches under the leadership of the Church of England engaged Grotius' attention right up to the last years of his life, although in 1636 and 1638 he recoiled from John Dury's scheme of uniting the Calvinistic churches. (The Development of Religious Toleration in England, II, 347 n). Grotius favored a union of the English, Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian churches. The English Ambassador to France, Scudamore, reported to Laud on one occasion: "Body and soul Grotius professeth himself to be for the Church of England, and gives this judgment of it, that it is the likeliest to last of any church this day in being."

England, as I have noted in the preceding chapter, had played a large part in the beginnings of the Dutch struggle for independence and the Dutch had always had a great sentimental appeal for the English as the active defenders of Protestantism against the power of Spain. Until the departure of Leicester from the Low Countries in 1587, the English monarch had had a part in Dutch government, and the habit, it seemed, had persisted. Nothing, then, could represent more of a threat to the united theological front of Protestantism than evidences of doctrinal defection in the Netherlands, and thus it seemed part of the duty of James, as the leader of the Protestant bloc in Europe, to step in and keep dissension in theology from wrecking the cause of Protestantism.

It was at the end of August, 1610, that James, while on one of his prolonged hunting expeditions,[1] read two of the works of Vorstius, *Tractatus Theologicus de Deo* (Steinfurt, 1610), and *Exegesis Apologetica*. It is almost certain that they had been given to him by Archbishop Abbot.

---

[1] James himself gives the circumstances in his *Declaration of the Most Serene King of Great Britain Concerning the Divers Actions of the Estates General of the Netherlands with regard to Conrad Vorstius*, London, 1612, which he wrote to carry out his threat made in his third message to the Estates General "to show the world" the atheism of Vorstius and those who supported him. Pattison recounts it thus: (*Casaubon*, p. 348) "Before the book [against du Perron] was off his hands came a pamphlet of Vorstius, which so absorbed James that for days he could talk of nothing else, and Casaubon must be there to be

Vorstius had not yet even been confirmed by the States of Holland as the successor to Arminius in the chair of theology at Leyden. (He was confirmed on October 19th). But the Counter-Remonstrants had some time earlier begun an international campaign against him. The leader in this movement seems to have been Sibbrandus Lubbertus, of Franeker who will appear again as Grotius' bête noir in England. He had constituted himself long since a sort of Committee of Correspondence to arouse the Protestant world in defence of orthodox High Calvinism. Six thousand of his letters remain to-day in the British Museum. He wrote a long letter to Archbishop Abbot on August 21st,[1] and James' letter to Winwood, opening his campaign against Vorstius, came on August 30th.

James made a list of the horrifying heresies contained in these two books. The first he conceived of as an heretical attack upon the nature of God. Vorstius had indeed had the temerity to cast rational doubt on the proposition that God could be truly infinite. He had even dared to question

---

talked to about it. James must reply to Vorstius. But Casaubon is not to be used against the arminian heretics. He is hardly sound himself there, (Eph. p. 896: 'Laudo regis zelum pro religione. scimus viros graves, et apprime doctos de Bertio non ita sentire, neque de Arminio.') and besides he is to be kept for the catholic controversy." See also Jordan, II, 335.

[1] Harrison, p. 179. See also p. 90. Lubbertus had written a letter to Andrew Melville of St. Andrewes in July, 1607, when Melville was imprisoned in the Tower. The letter had been intercepted by his jailers and had reached the Archbishop of Canterbury. Lubbertus had charged then that Arminius and Uitenbogaert wanted to change the doctrines of the Church and had secured the calling of a National Synod to revise the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession. Arminius and Uitenbogaert protested that this was baseless slander.

Divine Providence, that keystone of seventeenth-century belief.[1] "If all events were settled from eternity," James quoted him as saying, "there could be no occasion of continual providence."[2]

James lost no time in intervening. On August 30th (September 9th, new style), 1611, he wrote to Winwood, the English Ambassador at the Hague, instructing him to make a speech in the Estates General pointing out the heretical beliefs of Vorstius. Winwood, as will appear from his subsequent actions, was only too willing to do so. On September 21st at a meeting of the Estates, he delivered a vigorous speech in which he quoted at length from the works of

---

[1] See the Introduction to Professor Woodhouse's *Puritanism and Liberty* for the part it played in Puritan thought.

[2] Two chapters of Professor Hyma's book mentioned above: "Grotius in England", and "Results of his Mission", have been especially helpful to me in what immediately follows. I have had to come to some slightly different conclusions from his on matters relating to English theology, but the differences are small. Since I have seen his book only in typescript, my references and acknowledgements will have to be rather vague as to pages.
Fuller gives this summary of the King's interpretation of Vorstius' doctrines: (*Church History*, III, 249; Book X, sec. iv). "This wretch did seek to stoop God to man, by debasing His purity, assigning Him a material body, confining His immensity, as if His will were subject to change; darkening His omnisciency, as uncertain to future contingents; with many more monstrous opinions, fitter to be remanded to hell than committed to writing."
James, says Fuller, was led to interfere by "a just fear of the like infection within his own dominions, considering their vicinity of situation and frequency of intercourse, many of the English youth travelling over to have their education in Leyden." The sin of drunkenness was first brought, he says, from the Netherlands, "...so we must sadly confess that since that time, in a spiritual sense, many English souls have taken a cup too much of Belgic wine, whereby their heads have not only grown dizzy in matters of less moment, but their whole bodies stagger in the fundamentals of their religion."

Vorstius, and viewed with alarm the prospect of such a heretic being asked to a professorship at Leyden. He ended by saying that the king realized that this was really a matter for the provincial Estates and the curators of the University of Leyden, but that he had always dealt with the Estates General, and had had good relations with them. He insisted that the book on the Attributes of God should be burned. And James did have the two books of Vorstius which had roused his fury burned publicly in the cemetery of St. Paul's and at the two universities, the next year.

Oldenbarnevelt must have been angry at such a determined intrusion into Dutch affairs. He set to work to find out who had communicated all this to England,[1] and had a reply sent to the King on October 1st, reviewing the whole affair, pointing out that Vorstius had twice refuted the charges against him.

On October 6th, James, learning that the Estates General had taken no action, wrote another letter which was immediately published in several Dutch editions translated from the diplomatic French in which it had been written, no doubt by the Counter-Remonstrants who were glad to have this powerful assistance in the campaign against Vorstius.[2] James expressed his amazement that nothing had yet been done in the matter, although it is hard to guess what he thought the Estates General could have done, when he had admitted himself that it was beyond their jurisdiction. He is again amazed that they had allowed such a pest to get into such a high position. He goes on to add to his accusation against the Estates. Equally incriminating was the support they had given to "Arminius, the enemy of God". Vorstius, he now says, deserves to be burned at the stake.[1] The king will now be compelled to inform the young men of his realm that they may no longer study at Leyden. He takes occasion at the same time to attack Bertius, one of the heretics who abound at Leyden, who had had the temerity to send his book, De Apostasia Sanctorum, to Archbishop Abbot with a letter affirming that the contents of the book agreed with the doctrines of the Church of England.

---

[1] Harrison , p. 180.

[2] W. P. C. Knuttel, Catalogus van de pamfletten-verzameling berustende in de Kononklijke bibliotheek, 's Gravenhage, 1889-1920, 9 vols. in 11, Nos. 1868 and 1871. (For the numbers of works I give here as in Knuttel I am, of course, indebted to Professor Hyma).

There was more reason in James' attack than appears on the surface. Some years before a Swiss named Graser had published an attack on the Jesuits, dedicated to James, entitled Plagae Regiae, dedicated to the proposition that the Pope was Antichrist. Becanus, the old opponent of Casaubon, wrote an answer to this volume, citing the six "atheisms" of Vorstius as evidence that all was not well with Protestant doctrine either. This had touched Abbot closely, and he had thus interested himself in getting the aid of James in cleansing the Protestant camp. Abbot was the more disturbed by the threats to orthodoxy because as Master of University

---

[1] This was no idle threat. Fuller called Bartholomew Legate who was burned at Smithfield in 1612, "our English Vorstius". It may well be that the outcry against Vorstius contributed to Legate's sentencing.

College, Oxford, before his elevation to the Primacy, he had had to spend most of his time battling the liberal doctrines of Laud and his school there.

Thus the question of whether the elect could fall from grace or not has bobbed up again. The Calvinists, before this, might be content to accept the explanation that this was a doctrine on which differing views could be held within the Church, but it is not hard to see that they would change their minds when they find the incursions of heresy into the international unity of Protestantism supported by assertions that the apostasy of the elect was held to be the official doctrine of the English Church. Grotius was to try later to use this same doctrine of 'latitude' to pry the English Calvinists and Arminians apart.[1]

On November 5th James had Winwood make another speech to the Estates General. It was probably the intervention of Bertius which had now convinced James that Vorstius' Socinianism was also a characteristic of the Arminians, although all their official spokesmen insisted that this was not so.

---

[1] Bertius also sent a copy of his book to Casaubon, who knew enough not to commit himself. He wrote back to Bertius: (Harrison summarizes the letter, p. 181) "Richard Thomson introduced your book to me, but I am no theologian. I am occupied in reading the Fathers; I admire their piety; novelties do not suit my taste. Our people [the Reformed Churches] are against the Fathers. We could talk these questions out better. Morality and piety lie in the middle way between Pelagianism and Manicheeism. New opinions are abroad which deny that God is infinite, eternal, omnipotent, cognizant of the future. Reverence is destroyed. As for your book, if you had followed my advice you would never have sent it to the Archbishop. He is a very religious man, but of the opposite opinion." Bertius could never learn discretion, however.

James now links the two, and he has been maneuvered into exactly the position the Counter-Remonstrants want him to be in to carry their theological battle into their political crusade. And James will now find himself backing a party in Holland which has the same political aims as the English Puritans, whom he so abhors.

After reminding the Estates of the friendship James feels for his allies, Winwood goes on:

> For of what importance is it to His Majesty that Dr Vorstius has been appointed to a professorship in the University of Leyden or that the Arminian religion is preached in your churches except that as a Christian prince he strives for the dissemination of the Gospel and as your best friend and ally, he desires the establishment of your republic, the first foundations of which were reared in the cement with the blood of his subjects? You may yourselves judge the danger to which your state is subjected if the heresy of Arminius is permitted to be accepted by the majority of the citizens in your big towns, and if Vorstius becomes the professor of theology in the University of Leyden, which is the incubator of your churches.

He went on to charge that Vorstius was the spokesman in Holland for the pupils of Socinus, and that the theological students at Leyden themselves do not want him as their professor.[1] Winwood says that he has orders to exhort the Dutch to end the religious dissensions within their borders by refusing to tolerate the heresies taught by the disciples of Arminius. James threatens, furthermore, that if no attention is paid to his exhortations, his friendship for the Dutch people will vanish.[1]

---

[1] This was true. The petition of the students of the theological faculty at Leyden, signed by nearly all of them, to the provincial Estates of Holland and West Friesland, was printed in 1611. (Knuttel No. 1872) They say that the faculty at Heidelberg considered Vorstius as a person who does not agree with the fundamental principles of the Reformed Churches. The students say that they themselves have read his works and are of the same opinion.

On December 19, Winwood delivered a third oration to the Estates General. He remarks bitterly that the Estates had promised, in reply to his letter of September 21st demanding that Vorstius be removed from the country, that "measures would be taken indicating the respect that was due His Majesty." But Vorstius had been allowed to proceed to Leyden, nevertheless, had been received there with great honor, and had been allowed to take up his residence there in the status of professor. A second letter of protest, says Winwood, had received only a "confusing and evasive answer". Now he protests again, and if no reparation is made, if Vorstius is not removed, the king will find it necessary to express his displeasure and "will publish books to show the world how he despises the atheism and heresies of the aforesaid Vorstius and all those who maintain and support the same".

It is at this time that Casaubon opens his correspondence with Grotius. Grotius, in his letter to Maurice after

---

[1] It is possible that part of James' attack on the Arminians is motivated by his knowledge that Holland is becoming a formidable commercial and colonial rival of England, and that the dominating class in the rising Dutch economic power is Arminian. The data supplied by Professor Hyma in the article I mentioned in an earlier chapter ("Calvinism and Capitalism in the Netherlands 1555-1700") would go to prove this fact.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

his arrest, claimed that this correspondence was carried on with the knowledge of Oldenbarnevelt. Knight assumes that at the end of this correspondence Grotius had become James' representative in the Netherlands, a long bow to draw on the basis of James' request to Grotius merely to consult the Estates General on a general project, which was, in effect, only a way of withdrawing from something he did not want to do. Grotius had, in fact, launched his suggestion of a union of churches with a disavowal of Vorstius. In his first letter to Casaubon he spoke regretfully of the appointment of Vorstius. He launches his project there with the comment:

> What could be hoped for from a man who questions matters about which Christians have hitherto been agreed? The best plan it seems to me, will be for the Churches which do not admit the supremacy of Rome to declare their consent and concord in a public confession of faith, omitting matters as to which they are not agreed. 1

In this perspective, we may see Grotius' correspondence with Casaubon as a move by Oldenbarnevelt to provide a lever by which James' policy may be turned to the side of the Remonstrants. He may have been offering, through Grotius, a ground for conciliation, for the projected union of churches would have had to have a theological basis wide enough to include also the Remonstrants, and it would carry an automatic settlement of the disputes in Holland.

Knight also interprets Oldenbarnevelt's action in removing Vorstius to the Hague from Leyden as an outright de-

---

1 Molhuysen, I, 191.

fiance of James, when in fact it was as great a concession as could be made to James' demands, and still save the sovereignty of the state. To remove Vorstius to the Hague was effectively to remove him from his professorship, which was, after all, what James had demanded. Vorstius had published on December 15th a defence, entitled Christiana et Modesta Responsio,[1] dedicated to the Estates. Winwood had informed Oldenbarnevelt that the religious bond with England was broken. His feelings were expressed to Caron, the Dutch ambassador to England: "I hope", he said, "we are free to form a judgment on our own affairs".[2] But it seems he would not be free so to do until James saw things in another light. Oldenbarnevelt was, in his shrewd way, laying plans even then to make James see them that way.

It must be said that the Arminian party had chosen in Vorstius a weak reed to lean their defence upon, and Oldenbarnevelt finally felt that he had at least to make a show of bowing to James. On January 31st, 1612, Winwood wrote to James that Oldenbarnevelt had promised to do his best to have Vorstius removed from Leyden to the Hague to appear before the provincial assembly of Holland, and that Vorstius had indeed been called to await the meeting which would begin on February 20th (new style).[3]

James' Declaration had meanwhile appeared, brought out in Dutch by at least two publishers, at the same time as it appeared in London in French. The letter Vorstius wrote to James had not helped him much. He claimed that James had not been fully informed of his (Vorstius') teachings, and that he thought this was no time to renew religious persecution. The row was finally settled in this first aspect by the decision of the provincial Estates of Holland on April 28, 1612,[1] that Vorstius should leave Leyden and settle in Gouda, while continuing to draw his salary from Leyden. He was required furthermore to submit all his writings thenceforth to the judgment of the Estates. Vorstius remained at Gouda until 1618.

---

[1] Harrison, p. 183.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Harrison says (p. 184) that his appearance took place on March 22d, when he made a complete denial of all the charges against him.

This affair had been a defeat for the Remonstrants, but it also left the Counter-Remonstrants without an issue. It also left James in a position where he could enjoy showing his qualities of statesmanship, and this opportunity Oldenbarnevelt was well aware of. The latter was also well aware that the Remonstrants had lost ground politically by the events of the past few months, and that somehow the balance must be redressed. They could, with their minority position politically, be ruined by a very small change in the balance of power. Oldenbarnevelt knew that his best chance of redressing the situation was to show James the true outlines of this situation in political terms, to demonstrate to him that the Counter-Remonstrants were the equivalent of the English Puritans.

---

[1] Harrison says April 20th. He is figuring new style.

The political situation in the Netherlands had long been out of balance. The Estates General which represented all the provinces was dominated by the province of Holland, as the richest and most powerful of the provinces. Holland was predominantly Remonstrant, along with Utrecht, while the Counter-Remonstrants controlled in the other, smaller provinces. The battle over theological questions was, then, also the struggle of the predominantly High Calvinist, Counter-Remonstrant smaller provinces against the overwhelming economic power of Holland, and the struggle against the Remonstrants developed into a struggle against the Estates General. The strategy of the Counter-Remonstrants was to have a National Synod convened to decide on theological questions. They held that the Estates General had the power over religious questions, while Holland held that the provincial assemblies had that power. Four provinces decided that if Holland would not lend its consent in the Estates General to the calling of a National Synod, they would outvote it and convoke one to restore peace to the Church, which meant, of course, enforcing one interpretation of doctrine on the whole country, Holland and Utrecht included. There was no doubt that this doctrine would be the highest of High Calvinism. Holland pointed out that the Union of Utrecht allowed each province freedom of action in matters of religion on condition that liberty of conscience be preserved for all the inhabitants. Since they still held out the hope that the Catholic provinces in the south might one day be drawn into the Union, they claimed that that provision had better be kept. Maurice, despite his own ignorance of the theological issues involved, was finally drawn into the quarrel as head of the Counter-Remonstrants by his personal estrangement from Oldenbarnevelt, The Estates General, under the domination of Holland, held that the subject of election was of no great importance, and that although it was necessary to have a State Church and to defend it against heresy, heresy should not be so strictly defined as the Counter-Remonstrants demanded. The latter felt that those who did not accept Calvinistic absolute predestination should be cut off from the Church. The Remonstrant policy at this time was to avoid a National Synod at all costs, for they knew that there they would be crushed. The social division followed the theological. The rich merchant class which controlled the Netherlands through the oligarchic power exercised by the Estates of Holland, had ranged against them the lower middle classes under the banner of High Calvinism.. The latter found precedents in the political application of the principles of Calvinism which James so feared, which was to provide the backbone of the Revolution in England a quarter-century later: true believers had rendered their loyalty to God and not to the King of Spain in the recent wars, and they were prepared to view the Estates in the same light as Spain, if they did not get their way politically. Knight puts it thus:

> It was a fight, disguised however it might be, as much between the principle of popular and national government - that of the Calvinists - and the disintegrating and aristocratic platform of the Arminians, as between two rival

theological factions.[1]

The Calvinists feared, he goes on, that "the proposed toleration could have no other end than authorized encouragement of its [Arminianism's] propaganda, with, very probably, its eventual establishment in place of the orthodox creed." Professor Hyma describes the junction of the two questions very well:

> They [the Counter-Remonstrant ministers] made two demands: in the first place an independent church with self-government, free choice of preachers, elders, and deacons, liberty of assembly and of censure....besides liberty for themselves they also requested restriction of other denominations and cooperation from the government in applying their mode of persecution....it was impossible to grant both, for if the government was to assist the ministers in excommunicating members of the churches, it should be consulted in the appointment of the preachers, in the methods of persecution, and in the treatment of those who had been condemned. If it attempted to restrict the liberty of worship as little as possible, it should keep a careful watch that no overbearing synod compel it to apply severe measures. The church should either cease being a state church, or...remain under the control of the government. An independent church was permitted, but no independent state church. The unreasonable demand of the church was partly conceded by the government; unwillingly and hesitantly it offered assistance in checking other denominations and in excommunicating members of unsound beliefs. But that which the church had a right to ask for, independence, was refused. The church felt itself doubly wronged, partly for having been refused full cooperation in persecuting other denominations.[2]

---

[1] Page 153.

[2] MS. Chapter VII. I question whether, under seventeenth-century political conditions, these two demands could be separated. In fact, they would necessarily have some bearing on each other even under our present conditions. This was an attack on the sovereignty of the state as surely as James' interference was.

This issue developed to this final form only by 1617. In 1612, the Remonstrants were still working to modify the bases on which the State would brand dissenters as heretics. Grotius came to favor a policy of enforcing silence on the disputed points, a solution that both James and Charles resorted to in the next few years. His own beliefs he based on the Bible, the Reformers, the Fathers, and some of the Roman theologians of the sixteenth century. It was from this scholarly standpoint that he thought the churches of Protestantism could be united, and, like Casaubon, he saw the Anglican as the ideal meeting-place for all.[1] If Bertius thought that the theology of the English Church could include doctrines such as he advanced in his De Apostasia, we may perhaps assume that Grotius had the same idea. In his De Jure Belli ac Pacis, he advances the four basic principles of religion which he thought could be the basis for inclusion of all denominations in a unified church. Within that church there could be included various opinions on non-essentials such as predestination. The Anglican theologians and churchmen had the same general idea, but they of course insisted on a less broad and rationalistic set of basic principles. Nevertheless the doctrine of "things indifferent" which they held generally in common, Oldenbarnevelt, or Grotius, or Caron, or perhaps all three, saw was the instrument they could use to subtract the influence of James from the cause of the Counter-Remonstrants, and add it to the Remonstrants'. The policy of the Estates was actually one that James himself and Charles were going to be forced to use later.[1] The Estates had forbidden the discussion of the controverted points of doctrine altogether, and the Estates of Holland had enforced the rule, notably in Schieland, by fining and ejecting orthodox ministers, even when they resorted, as they did with impunity in other provinces, to lectures to warn their people against the heresies of the Remonstrants.

---

[1] Professor Jordan's discussion of Grotius' theology represents it at a later period than this, (The Development of Religious Toleration in England, II, 344-349) when his rationalism is much more advanced. His theoretical statement of a theory of toleration did not, of course, prevent him from favoring repression of Calvinistic preaching during the period just before the debacle. Professor Jordan represents the Remonstrants as more innocent bystanders than they really were. Their alliance with the government of Oldenbarnevelt was as close as the Calvinists' with that of Maurice later.

James now threw a bombshell into the camp of the Counter-Remonstrants, who had been proceeding on the assumption that their cause had his complete approval. In March of 1613 he wrote another letter to the Estates General, a copy of which he also sent to the Estates of Holland, which showed that he had reversed his position. He writes now that he has observed with sorrow the disputes between the preachers, that he has read the articles in which both parties had set forth their opinions, and he hastens to tell them that he has learned that disputes of this character cannot be settled by conferences; they must be dealt with by the authority of the civil government. "...nous vous avisons", he says, "que l'experience nous a faict cognoistre, qu'à grand peine telles questions se terminent par disputes de théologiens, ains qu'il est plus convenable les assoupir par authorité publicque".[1] The Estates, he continues, should not allow such questions to be brought up in the pulpit and among the people; they should command the preachers to maintain peace through mutual toleration until the civil authorities can be fully instructed and issue their orders.

---

[1] James in his *Directions concerning Preachers* of 1622, (see *Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I*, ed. J. R. Tanner, Cambridge, 1930, pp. 80-82), Charles I in his re-issue of the Articles with *His Majesty's Declaration* prefixed. See also Godfrey Davies, "English Political Sermons, 1603-1640", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, III, (1939) 1-22.

Since this was exactly the platform of the government and of the Remonstrants, the sensation that this about-face caused can be imagined. James proceeded, furthermore, to retract handsomely his libel on the Arminians:

> And we think that we can persuade you to maintain peace all the more strongly because we have studied a certain writing that Sir Noel Caron has presented to us, in which the opinions of both parties have been fully set forth, with the reasons why each party thinks as it does; in which we do not see enough difference of opinion to feel that either confession does not accord with the truth of the Christian faith and the salvation of souls.

The proportions of the coup that Oldenbarnevelt had brought off with this letter from James are indicated by one of the clauses in his death-sentence six years later:

> That he with evil intention has requested and has secured from His Majesty, the King of Great Britain, certain letters which he previously had had composed in this country, corrected, and

---

[1] Knuttel, 2061 and 2062.

> sent to the ambassador, for the sake of promoting his design, and for the same purpose delivered them to the States General, maintaining silence on the manner in which they had been obtained.

It is hard to decide the part Grotius played in the composition of this letter. In the examination he underwent before his trial five years later he denied stoutly that he had made the translation of the Remonstrants' Five Articles into French, or added the commentary which had won James over.[1] He was also asked if he had aided James in the composition of the letter. This he denied doing also, although he said that he would have been glad to do so if Oldenbarnevelt had asked him. Caron, Grotius said, had told him when he (Grotius) was in London, that he (Caron) had been given a paper when he was in the Hague the previous winter which he had taken along with him to England, with the intention of securing with it a letter from the King. Grotius said also that the King had told him that Caron had indeed presented such a paper to him; James said that he had examined the draft carefully and added a few lines of his own to it, those in which he claimed that the question of predestination did not seriously endanger the faith, "in order that he might point out the difference between this point and others". The real authors, Grotius added, were Uitenbogaert and Oldenbarnevelt. At another session of his examination (December 4th, 1618) he was again asked: "Did you compose the draft of the letter which the King of Great Britain wrote on March 16th, English style, addressed to the States General concerning the differences in religious beliefs and the ending of the same?" His answer was, again, "No, I did not have any knowledge of this letter or paper before I arrived with the other commissioners to discuss the East India questions with the English merchants." To the cryptic question of why the draft had had to be changed eight times, the significance of which is not apparent, he answered simply that he did not know.

---

[1] Professor Hyma cites Robert J. Fruin, Verhooren en andere bescheiden betreffende het rechtsgeding van Hugo de Groot, Utrecht, 1871, pp. 238, 187-188.

The belief that Grotius was the author of this letter probably arose from the knowledge that he was the actual author of later statements of the Remonstrants, such as the Resolution of the States of Holland, which was supposed to settle the dispute in 1614. At that time Uitenbogaert said that the Resolution was the work of a learned man and a member of the Estates, but not a Remonstrant. Triglandus answered then:

> Namelijck segghen wij Hugo Grotius, Pensionaris van Rotterdam, die wel gheen Remonstranten was, dat is, Predikant die de meergenoemde Remonstrantie aen hare Ed. Mog. hadde overgegeven, maer evenwel een groot fauteur ende voorstander van de Remonstranten. [1]

Grotius could not have influenced James personally in the writing of this letter, since it had already been dispatched before he arrived in England, and he did not see the

---

[1] Kerckelycke Geschiedenissen, 1650, p. 682.

King until May 15th.[1] He may have been reminded of the principle of "things indifferent" if Casaubon had reported to him (as we may be sure he did) the comment Grotius made in one of his letters to Casaubon in the first days of their correspondence:

> But the questions which divide us are few and unimportant compared with the questions upon which we all agree. It remains, therefore to separate from non-essentials what cannot be abandoned without peril.[2]

I think it must be concluded, however, that Grotius might have been the source of Oldenbarnevelt's strategy. He it was who could tell Oldenbarnevelt, from his correspondence with Casaubon, what appeal would have most effect with James. Caron, it is admitted later, has little knowledge of theological questions.

Grotius, then, received the line he should follow with James from Oldenbarnevelt, but it is probable that Oldenbarnevelt had received his ideas on the strategy which had succeeded so well thus far, from Grotius. Oldenbarnevelt was well aware, however, that the largest influence on James was that of Abbot and the High Calvinists and he knew, from the speed with which James had already shifted his ground, that the same thing could happen again. Thus he instructs Grotius, there is little reason to doubt, to do all he can to make the liberal theologians around the King into a group to back the cause of the Remonstrants. As I shall demonstrate, it does not seem that Grotius went to England with the intention of seeing James. His first letter from there to Oldenbarnevelt advances the idea of an interview with James as if it were outside his instructions.

---

[1] There is no definite date available for Grotius' arrival in England. Knight says 'near the end of March'. His first letter from England to Oldenbarnevelt is dated April 19th. Knight is, of course, mistaken when he says that the object of Grotius' mission was to obtain the letters from James. That had been accomplished before he arrived.

[2] Molhuysen I, 200.

Grotius went to England as a member of a mission to treat with English Commissioners on the affairs of the East Indies Companies of each. This cover for his real mission needs no extended treatment here. The English were claiming that under the principle of freedom of the seas, they were justified in carrying on commercial operations in the East Indies where the Dutch felt they had, (and where they had enforced) prior rights by reason of the expense of lives and treasure they had been put to in driving out the Portuguese and Spanish. In 1611 the Dutch had forcibly ejected the English from certain ports in the Indies, and in the same year the English merchants had presented a petition to the Estates General, demanding freedom of the seas. The Dutch had managed to ignore the issue until now, but it seemed necessary to make some settlement of the question at this time, when James was making disturbing overtures to Spain. Any agreement of England and Spain would leave the Dutch without their leading ally. Knight points out the irony in the fact that Grotius is to defend here a principle opposite to the one he had conceived and defended in his Mare Liberum. But Professor Hyma demonstrates that Grotius' interpretation of this principle would cover the position the Dutch were defending. He claims in Mare Liberum that the sea and lands adjacent to them were free only until someone built upon the land. After a nation has erected fortifications upon a shore and has signed contracts with the natives, competitors from other nations must be subject at least to tolls. The seas are free only until those who own them contract to let someone else control them. The fact that the Mare Liberum is not cited against Grotius[1] during the course of the negotiations strengthens this argument.

In the examination before his trial, Grotius was to admit that Oldenbarnevelt had talked to him just before he went to England and had then urged him to do all he could to further the interests of the Estates of Holland. He said that once in England, the Earl of Fenton had asked him to have an audience with the King, and that he had gone to the house of the earl for that purpose.[2] Oldenbarnevelt told his judges that the reason the Dutch Ambassador had received written orders to keep everything relating to the King's letters secret from the rest of the commissioners except Grotius was merely that the other commissioners would have no interest in that matter, since they had been sent out to deal only with the questions of the East India Company.[1] Professor Hyma tells us that Pauw, one of the commissioners, had in fact received a special letter from Maurice which was his credentials for an interview with James about the religious question, and that he tried to use this letter under the pretext of talking to the King about the affairs of the Dutch East India Company, but Grotius frustrated his plan.[2]

---

[1] Although, as Knight points out, Sir Julius Caesar was at the same time making transcriptions from the book for his own use. (Lansdowne MSS. 142 (67)), (Knight, p. 142).

[2] Who this earl was, or how he figured at the Court I have not been able to determine. The Complete Peerage (London, 1926, II, 294) lists the Viscountcy (Scottish) of Fentoun. Thomas (Erskine) Lord Dirletoun who had been so created in 1604 was created Viscount of Fentoun in 1606. He does not figure further in Grotius' transactions.

There is no doubt, then, that the principal business for which Grotius was included in the commission that went to England was to further the interests of the Remonstrants with James. He was to try to demonstrate to James that the political alignment in the Netherlands was like that in England, and that the Counter-Remonstrants were the Puritans of the Netherlands. He was to try to persuade the King to lend his support also to the edict of toleration which Oldenbarnevelt intended soon to have the Estates of Holland promulgate. He was also instructed to sound out the English bishops, and was authorized to represent himself to them as the representative of the Estates.[1]

---

[1] This would seem to indicate that Caron might have been travelling back to England on the same ship with the commissioners, and that perhaps Grotius was in London before the letters were sent by James. But it is more likely, I think, that Oldenbarnevelt considered this matter a continuing one, and at any rate we know that Grotius did not see the king until May 15th.

[2] He cites Uitenbogaert's Kerckelijcke Historie, Book IV, 65-68. The commissioners dealt with another English commission, and had no dealings with the Court.

One of the charges which were made against Grotius at the time of his trial[2] was that he had tried during his trip to England to induce some English Arminians to come to the Dutch Republic. At first blush it seems that this must be merely a twisting of his invitations to those who had extended hospitality to him to return his visit so that he might repay their hospitality. Probably, however, it reflects the instructions he received from Oldenbarnevelt before he left, that he should find out which of the English theologians were favorable to the Remonstrants so that they could be invited in case the Remonstrants had to accede to the demands for a national synod to settle the religious questions.

Finally, Oldenbarnevelt's purpose in sending Grotius rather than depending entirely on Caron may be seen in the phrase used about Caron by Archbishop Abbot in Grotius' letter reporting his interview with Abbot on May 17, 1613.[3] Abbot told Grotius that Caron was not sufficiently schooled in scholastic terms to make clear his opinions. Oldenbarnevelt may well have been aware that he needed a theological ambassador as well as a political one, to keep James consistent in his actions, since he had just had a demonstration of the King's acting in political affairs on theological terms, and vice versa.

---

[1] Knight says: (p. 143) "It is certain...that, aided by Casaubon, he was endeavoring secretly to influence the King to desert that policy [of supporting the Counter-Remonstrants; as I have demonstrated, James had already deserted it] and, at the same time, to secure the support in those efforts of the ecclesiastics of the school of Andrewes and Overall."

[2] No. 18, of a total of 131.

[3] Molhuysen, I, 236.

On his arrival in England, Grotius of course immediately sought out Casaubon. They were introduced first at the lodgings of the young prince of Baden, and thereafter, Grotius says, they saw each other daily, although Casaubon was "at high pressure on Baronius".[1] He was immediately introduced by Casaubon to Overall and Andrewes, and they dined together frequently. Casaubon apparently gave up a great deal of time to be with Grotius, who charmed him completely. Pattison quotes Casaubon's impression of the young man:

> I knew him before to be a wonderful man; but the superiority of that divine genius no one can properly appreciate, without seeing his countenance, and hearing his conversation. Integrity is stamped on his face; in his talk is exhibited the union of exquisite learning and genuine piety. Nor is it I only who am so taken with our visitor, all the learned and good who have been introduced to him have fallen under the spell, and the king more than any one. [2]

This verdict may be considered later when we deal with the impression Grotius made on Archbishop Abbot.

Grotius is finding out the true state of affairs theological in England in this intercourse. His first report to Oldenbarnevelt[3] dated April 19th says that his first order of business has been to consult Andrewes, Overall, and

---

[1] Pattison's Casaubon, pp. 345-346.
[2] Epp. 881, Pattison, p. 346.
[3] Molhuysen, I, 231-232.

Casaubon, who have said that they feel that the terms in which the Remonstrants put the issues of the dispute are the correct ones, and that they have assured him that the leading learned men of England feel the same way.[1] He has begun the letter by expressing his joy at James' letter to the Estates, and he hopes that this will end the misuse by the spirits of evil of the King's authority. But, he reports, a book entitled Baro's *Summa Trium* has just been received in England, containing "two orations of Whitaker on the question of predestination, with some articles made at Lambeth about the same question, the intent of the editor being to show that the opinion of the English Church accords with that of the Counter-Remonstrants.[2] He has, however, been informed by the men he has just mentioned that this is a misrepresentation. Andrewes, who had been present at the conference at Lambeth, informs him that Whitaker had presented these points altogether differently, clearly excluding the meaning the Counter-Remonstrants would now put on them, and that the meaning had been altered by them ('geroyeert'). Andrewes says that the truth of what he says can be demonstrated by the minutes of that meeting which are in his possession, and that the Articles were written so as to give the victory to neither party, although he and Whitgift had admittedly had to put them in a very difficult form. Furthermore it was not true that they were the official doctrine of the English Church. By the custom of the country they would have to be confirmed by public authority and this has never been done. They have furthermore never been recognized because the Lord Treasurer had forbidden Whitaker to publish them; they have never been printed in England, nor will they be allowed to be.[1]

---

[1] He has apparently mixed up the men and their reputations. He speaks of Andrewes as "a man with unusual credit with the King" (as indeed he was) but he refers to Overall as being "much valued by the King for his writings against the Jesuits", which description would rather suit Andrewes. Casaubon, he says, is "every day with the King".

[2] This was, as I have mentioned above, *Petri Baronis Summa Trium de Praedestinatione Sententiarum...Quibus accedunt Assertiones orthodoxae seu articuli Lambethani.* Hardrovici, 1513, /misprinted for 1613/ The preface signed A. T. is by Thysius, a Counter-Remonstrant leader. There is no doubt that this is part of a propaganda campaign directed at England where both sides of the Dutch quarrel knew the balance of power lay. As I have mentioned in my note on Robert Some in Chapter V, I believe the publication of a book of his at the same place in the same year is also a part of this campaign. This one had apparently arrived in England just at the time Grotius did.

Grotius goes on to report that Casaubon has told him several times that the King would like to speak to him about the religious question. He has no intention of intruding into this part of the matter; he says he will not be in a hurry to talk to James about it unless he is requested to do so. This comment indicates that Grotius' mission had been at first only to make sure of the support of the Arminian party in the Church[1] and that, now having found such good encouragement from them, and having received through Casaubon a direct invitation to see the King, he is requesting authority to extend the scope of his mission. His wording also may include the possibility that he had been authorized to talk to James but only on limited subjects, and that he wants permission to bring up the more central points. He goes on to ask instructions on how to bring out the question. He is confident, he says, that he could bring it to a good end, and that Andrewes, Casaubon, and Overall could be very useful. He is sure that these three will approve easily everything that the most moderate among the Dutch could conceive. The French ambassador has done much good with the King in this business also.[2] Grotius has been told by several persons of quality that the King and the Archbishop have interpreted the Five Points (of the Remonstrant Creed) in the light of their Puritanical education and that they haven't been told the true purpose of them. He thinks it will be very easy to make them change their minds.

---

[1] This seems to dispose pretty thoroughly of the question of the status of the Lambeth Articles at this date. It lends credence to the Arminian claim that they were suppressed by some sort of official action. This also explains, of course, why they now have to be printed abroad.

---

[1] His phrasing here indicates, moreover, that he and Oldenbarnevelt had in mind to "tune the pulpits" for the Remonstrants. He says: "In case your excellency concludes that something could be done here toward the settlement of our controversy, we shall have to find how far we can go and in what way we should approach the subject, in the pulpit. To make a suggestion, I think it could be arranged that we could use the Bishop of Ely and the dean [Overall] and M. Casaubon for this purpose."

[2] The French Ambassador at this time was a certain M. de la Broderie, Grotius calls him the Lord of Buisseaux, whose name does not further figure in Grotius' mission. Casaubon took Grotius to dine at the French embassy soon after his

Grotius' next letter to Oldenbarnevelt reports the results of his first interview with James, which lasted two hours. It is dated May 15, 1613.[1] During the month that has intervened, we may perhaps assume that Grotius was busy with his duties on the commission treating of the East Indies. He may, too, have been waiting for instructions from Oldenbarnevelt on how to proceed. At the time of his trial, Grotius admitted that he had received letters from Oldenbarnevelt while he was in England, and that they were about the religious questions. Perhaps Abbot had made it difficult for him to see James. His comment at the beginning of this letter, that the King had again changed his mind under the prompting of Abbot and Winwood, suggests that Grotius was sent, or went, to see James only because James had gone back to his policy of opposition to the Remonstrants. He tells Oldenbarnevelt that Caron will inform him of the way Winwood and Abbot had talked James around again. This may indicate that Grotius is giving his reasons for seeking an interview with James which Oldenbarnevelt has not expressly sanctioned.

The other letters we have preserved from this month before he saw the King: short notes about dinner engagements and arrangements for interviews between Grotius and Casaubon, Overall, and Andrewes, indicate that these men were his constant companions. The day after he saw James,

---

arrival, perhaps by invitation. Since his accompanying of a Dutch embassy to France in his youth, Grotius seems to have had many friends there.

[1] Molhuysen, I, 234-235.

Grotius received from Overall a long letter containing a disquisition on his views of predestination. Overall's view is much what I have outlined before; he tries to maintain that the English theology is a compromise between High Calvinism and the Remonstrants, but it is obvious that Grotius has reason for saying that they are not very far from each other. It was no doubt from Casaubon or Andrewes that he learned that James was ready to reverse himself again. Andrewes was not much help, if what Abbot and Chamberlain report of his words is correct.

Before I go on to analyze more closely Grotius' report of his visit to James, a reproduction of the letter which Abbot wrote to Winwood near the end of Grotius' stay will do much to show what Grotius had to contend with. There is no doubt that Abbot did not conceal from the King that he was working strongly against Grotius, and there is no doubt either that he and Winwood realized what was at stake, the whole issue of the battle, political and theological, on the Continent. Episcopius, the Remonstrants' leading scholar, who succeeded Vorstius in the chair at Leyden, reported of Winwood:

> Winwood, who during his residence at the Hague appears to have acted as the creature of the archbishop, encouraged the Gomarist [Counter-Remonstrant] divines to detail all their grievances to him, and he as readily forwarded them to the bishop or to James, who so far forgot himself as actually to stand opposed to the authorities of Holland, and foster the rebellious proceedings of these divines and their adherents. 1

---

1 Quoted by Professor Hyma from Memoirs of Simon Episcopius, New York, 1837, p. 129.

Although this statement is from the other side, it seems to be fully borne out by the terms and tone of this letter from Abbot, and by the events which followed. Winwood, like his friend Sir Dudley Carleton who succeeded him at the Hague, was interested in getting on in the King's service, and his alliance with Abbot was profitable on both sides.

Abbot's letter is written from Lambeth on the 1st of June, 1613, After acknowledging a letter of Winwood's which had spoken of the reception accorded the Princess Elizabeth in the Low Countries on her way, with her new husband the Elector Palatine Frederick, to her new kingdom, he goes on:

> But concerning the other Parts of your Letter, I have thus much more to advertise you. You must take heed how you trust Doctor Grotius too far, for I perceive him so addicted to some Partialities in those Parts, that he feareth not to lash, so it may serve a turn.

This would seem to indicate that Grotius had not made his theological position clear - if, indeed he had had any position - before his departure on his mission to England. It suggests that his contacts with the theologians in England were crystallizing his sentiments. It also indicates that Oldenbarnevelt had chosen his emissary well, since, if Winwood must be thus warned by Abbot, it must be that he had not prepared Abbot or James against him before his arrival. Abbot's observation that Grotius will 'lash' indicates that he was by this time aware of the purpose Grotius has of stinging those men in England who are his theological allies into being his political allies as well.

This phrase should be read in conjunction with Abbot's recital, later on in the letter, of how Grotius advertised Andrewes' theological principles to serve his purpose in gaining allies for his cause. Andrewes was a definite part of the strategy of Grotius, but if he depended upon him, he was to be sadly deceived. Grotius closed his last report to Oldenbarnevelt from England by a promise to have Andrewes influence James toward Grotius' views and to have him keep James in a favorable mood toward the Remonstrants.[1] But as we shall see, Abbot and his allies were able to cancel the operation of this influence, even had Andrewes really wanted to exert it.

Abbot goes on:

> At his first coming to the King, by reason of his good Latine Tongue, he was so tedious and full of tittle-tattle, that the King's Judgment was of him, that he was some Pedant, full of Words and of no great Judgment. And I my self discovering that to be his Habit, as if he did not imagine that every man was bound to hear him so long as he would talk (which is a great Burthen to Men repleat with Busyness), did privately give him notice thereof, that he should plainly and directly deliver his Mind, or else he would make the King weary of him.

Against this opinion we must place that of Casaubon which I have quoted above, and the perhaps equally partial judgment of Grotius himself, that the King was much pleased with his talk. I am more willing to accept Grotius' judgment, in the first place because I cannot imagine James being bored by a "Pedant", since James' great delight was pedantry, but, more important, because Abbot contradicts his own conclusion here, when, at the end of this letter, he reveals that James had been enough impressed by Grotius' arguments to warn Caron against giving him reports of affairs in Holland as partial as those he was getting from Winwood. Such a statement certainly does not indicate that James has been left unconvinced by Grotius. The whole letter, in fact, is written to warn Winwood about the new balance of power in England effected by Grotius, and to advise Winwood to trim his attitude and reports accordingly.[1]

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 237. See below. Molhuysen claims in his Introduction that Winwood had warned Abbot against Grotius before the latter's arrival in England. I think Abbot's warning Winwood not to trust Grotius too far in the first sentences of the letter I quote indicates that Winwood had not warned him.

> This did not so take place [Abbot continues], but that afterwards he fell to it again, as was especially observed one Night at Supper at the Lord Bishop of Ely's, [Andrewes] whither being brought by Monsieur Casaubon (as I think) my Lord intreated him to stay to Supper, which he did. There was present Doctor Steward and another Civillian, unto whom he flings out some Question of that Profession, and was so full of Words, that Dr Steward afterwards told my Lord, that he did perceive by him that like a Smatterer he had studyed some two or three Questions, whereof when he came in Company he must be talking to

---

[1] Molhuysen says of this letter: "It is, of course, not necessary to praise all of Grotius' actions highly, but if we should believe Abbot, Grotius was a very superficial person, who prepared his speeches and conversation beforehand, in order to show off at dinners and similar occasions. Grotius really did not have to do that. Perhaps the unfriendly verdict of Abbot can be attributed to the fact that this young man (Grotius was thirty years old at the time) who had read a great deal, who was completely up to date, and had a profound knowledge of the theological problems of that day, whose keen line of reasoning is also apparent in his letters, and who was a master of argument, led the conversation, a fact that was not very agreeable to the older people, especially to someone [like Abbot] who was not used to being contradicted." (I, xxiv).

> vindicate his Skill; but if he were put from those, he would show himself but a simple Fellow.[1] There was present also Dr Richardson the King's Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, and another Doctor in that Faculty, with whom he falleth in also about some of those Questions which are now controverted among the Ministers in Holland. And being Matters wherein he was studyed, he uttered all his Skill concerning them; my Lord of Ely sitting still at the Supper all the while, and wondering what a Man he had there, who never being in the Place or Company before, could overwhelm them so with Talk for so long a time. I write this unto you so largely, that you may know the Disposition of the Man and how kindly he used my Lord of Ely for his good Entertainment. For when he took his Leave of the King, he fell into Discourse what a famous Church was here in England; what worthy Men the Bishops were, how he admired the ecclesiasticall Government; what great Contentment he received by Conference with many learned Men: But, saith he, I do perceive that your great Men do not all agree in those Questions now controverted amongst us; for in talking with my Lord of Ely, I perceive that he is of Opinion that a Man that is truly Justifyed and sanctifyed, may excidere a gratia although not finaliter yet totaliter. The King's Majesty knowing that my Lord of Ely had heretofore inclined to that Opinion, but being told the King's Judgment of it had made Shew to desist from broaching any such thing (for then it was as well finaliter as totaliter), did secretly complaine to me that my Lord should revive any such thing, and especially make it known unto a Stranger.

Discounting as we may the undependability of Abbot as a reporter, this little incident is very revealing. On a wider scale it perhaps indicates a reason for James' choosing Abbot rather than Andrewes for Canterbury in 1611. It indicates that, however much the Anglicans had prevailed with James in matters of discipline, the Arminians among them were losing influence in the Church. James' flirtation with the Catholic powers would naturally make him seek for means to make it clear that he was not being theologically influenced in his diplomacy, and this desire would make him incline more to a High Calvinist position. For the picture of the progress of Grotius' mission, this statement indicates that Grotius is deliberately bringing these disagreements, which have been buried in high policy, out into the open to serve his turn. We may perhaps imagine that Andrewes had invited Abbot to be present with Grotius so that it should not be noised abroad that the Arminians were closeting themselves with Grotius. It seems at any rate that Andrewes is more interested in keeping on the right side of Abbot and James than in serving Grotius' interests. What he told Grotius, of course, we do not know. Grotius seems to have got the impression that Andrewes was on his side; certainly Andrewes must have told him these theological views which Grotius had retailed to the King. And he could not have got the "inside" story of the Lambeth Articles from anyone but Andrewes. Grotius seems to think that he has enlisted Andrewes to defend his interests, when he leaves England. But this was to prove not to be true.

---

[1] This judgment, however partial again, may well reflect the fact that Grotius was getting an education in theology during his stay in England, and that there were some gaps in his overall knowledge of the subject.

Abbot's letter goes on:

> Whereupon I moved my Lord in it, and told him what the Doctor had said, and to whom; but thereunto he replyed with earnest Asseveration, that he had not used any such Speech unto him, and was much abused by that Report; and thereupon offered by Letters sent into Holland to challenge Grotius for it, as having done him a singular Wrong to report so of him to the King.

Abbot's conversation with Andrewes, of course, took place after Grotius had gone back to Holland, and it may well have been that Andrewes, having been carried away by Grotius' eloquence, and being aware that James was favoring the Remonstrants, thinking that a new day was going to dawn also for the English Arminians, had lent his prestige to Grotius' mission for a while, but that when Abbot charged him with it, the climate had changed, James had swung back on his old course again, and it behooved him to revert to his old caution. I am aware that this seems to catch the venerable Andrewes in a lie, but I cannot imagine that Grotius was so stupid himself as to use evidence that could be immediately voided by a denial. At any rate, in the passage of the letter which follows, Abbot's tactics of intimidation, even of threat, are seen at work on Andrewes. They did their work well, as the record will show. He continues:

> I replyed, that I held it fitter to let it alone; not to draw Contention on himself with so busy a Man. I would satisfy the King, and so might his Lordship also; but he would do well to be wary how he had to do with any of those Parts ill affected; for he had been once before so served by Bertius the Author of the Book De Apostasia Sanctorum; who upon speech with Dr Bedwell at Leyden vauntingly gave it out, that his Lordship and the Bishop of Lincoln were of his opinion, You will ask me what is this to you? I must tell you therefore that you shall not be without your part. At the same time that Sir Noel Caron was together with Grotius, being now to take his leave of the King, it was desired of his Majesty that he [Caron (?)] would not hastily give his Judgment concerning Points of Religion now in Difference in Holland, for that his Majesty had Information but of one side; and that his Ambassador did deal partially, making all Reports in Favour of the one side, and saying nothing at all for the other. For he might have let his Majesty know, how factious a Generation those Contradictors are; how

> they are like to our Puritans in England; how refractory they are to the Authority of the Civill Magistrate, and other Things of like Nature, as I wrote you in my former Letter. I doubt not but Grotius had his part in this Information, whereout I conceive you will make some use, keeping these Things privately to your self, as becometh a Man of your Imployment. When his Majestie told me this, I gave such an Answer as was fit, and now upon the Receipt of your Letters, shall upon the first Occasion give further Satisfaction. All Things rest here as they did, and I as ready to do you all good Offices, do remaine, &c.
>
> From Lambeth,[1]
>
> G. Cant.

Grotius' report to Oldenbarnevelt is written on the same day in which he has talked with the King for two hours, "alone", "about our religious disputes". Having seen that the King liked him, Grotius goes on, he has reviewed for him "the diversity of opinions which had prevailed in the churches both before and after the time of St. Augustine concerning the subject of predestination, and also the diversity of opinion among the most notable clergyment among the Protestants..." James was not inclined before to believe the moderate opinions of Melanchthon and Hemingius, but after long discussion Grotius has managed nevertheless to convince him that the opinions of Calvin and Beza were not free of blasphemy, and that they had made God the author of sin. James had finally declared as much. This was a large admission for a young unschooled theologian to have elicited from a man as sure as James was of the grounds of his belief. Grotius goes on to report that the King was still somewhat offended by the Remonstrants' teaching that Christ died for all. He has, however, been able to explain it to him "with distinction of interpretation and application", and to confirm it by notable passages in the Bible. The King was convinced by Grotius' final explanation: that it "is like a general pardon which His Majesty is used to publish, from which no one has any profit but the person who sees the letters about it."[1] Grotius then went on, he says, to present the dire consequences of the doctrine of irresistible grace, and in what way the people who believed in it changed Bible passages to suit their interpretation. The King expressed great distaste for these changes in the passages he was shown. One of these changes was made by Piscator; he had changed "alle" in translating a passage which said Christ died for all, into "allerley menschen" or "some few people". Grotius also showed the King the danger there was in some new decisions that James had himself allowed, as for instance the action of the French Churches in making the statement that the Pope was Anti-Christ into an article of faith. Grotius said that he himself thought it was true but that it was obviously against any chance of making such a comprehensive church as he and James had conceived of in their correspondence. All this evidence is bringing James around to the point of being able to realize that those who "use newfangleness" are not the Arminians, but their enemies.[1]

---

[1] Sir Ralph Winwood, Memorials of Affairs of State...., three volumes, London, 1725, III, 459-460.

---

[1] Here we may see the first traces, perhaps, of what was to be Grotius' distinctive contribution to theology: his theory of the Atonement, which he first promulgated in 1617 in his Defensio fidei Catholicae de Satisfactione Christi adversus Faustum Socinum Senensum (See Williston Walker, History of the Christian Church, p, 456; Knight, pp. 268 ff.) The English edition of this work (Oxford, 1636) says Knight, was for the purpose of influencing the English Church.

Finally Grotius gets to the point where theological clarification leads to political policy:

> Then I took up the usurpation of the new clergy and the rights of the civil government; they asking more than was permitted to the old clergy of the old Princes. When I made mention here of the Puritans, His Majesty told me that Ambassador Winwood had asserted in the strongest terms that our Counter-Remonstrants were not Puritans. I said to His Majesty that...they always maintained that the ecclesiastical ordinances should not be published in the name of the civil authorities, and that they endeavoured to secure complete control over the election to ecclesiastical offices for themselves and their elders, to the exclusion of the civil authorities; whereupon His Majesty uttered a loud exclamation, saying that he had no longer any doubt that they were Puritans.

Grotius, pressing his advantage, went on to say that these same malcontents in Holland wrote to Winwood and Abbot to enlist them on their side against the Moderates. The King assured Grotius that he would order Winwood and Abbot to dismiss such people, that he was of the opinion that the Estates General should go on making ecclesiastical laws, and that they should beware lest in making them they give these people too much authority. They then came to discussion of the disputes of the past years about the calling of a National Synod. Grotius pointed out how many of the Dutch clergy were offended by this project of revising the Confession and the Catechism, and he told James why such a revision was necessary. James answered that in his opinion such objections were wrong, that all confessions should be freely revised in Synods, but that they should not be finally changed except with the consent of the civil government. In England, he tells Grotius, these things are the work of King and Parliament. The King then suggested that this confession might be such as to serve to unite all Protestants in accordance (Grotius tells Oldenbarnevelt) with the tenor of some letters he (Grotius) had written to Casaubon.[1] Grotius assures Oldenbarnevelt that he has spoken to James about him, and has convinced James of the desirability of using moderation in theological affairs, "that the writings of Calvin and Beza and other new teachers should not now take the place of Papal Decretals". He has also, he says, convinced him of the desirability of hindering the introduction of new doctrines which go against common belief.

---

[1] Strangely enough, James was to call the leader of this French Church, du Moulin, to London in 1615 to assist in devising a method of uniting the Churches. It was in the support of this union that James intended to use the Archbishop of Spalatro.

In closing, Grotius reports that he has found that James has been given bad reports of Elias Oldenbarnevelt, his patron's brother, who had led the Dutch Mission to England in 1610, and also about Uitenbogaert and van der Myle. He hopes he has succeeded in giving the King a better opinion of these men. He has also praised the advice the King has given the Estates, and has asked him to go on giving them his good counsel.

---

[1] This phrase of course indicates that Oldenbarnevelt had not known about Grotius' correspondence with Casaubon after all. But perhaps Grotius felt he must refresh his memory, or, if this letter were intercepted, he did not wish to implicate Oldenbarnevelt any farther than necessary.

It is hard to determine, from the letters of Grotius that we have, how many times he saw James. After his return to Holland, and after the affair of the Ordinum, he reports an interview when the King had sent for him and they had discussed the affair of Vorstius.[1] But this seems to refer to his parting interview which, as far as I know, was his second. I have concluded that he saw the King only twice, although from the number of subjects they touched on it is apparent that they were long interviews.

Three days after his first report on May 18th, Grotius writes again to Oldenbarnevelt to report on a visit he had had the day before with Archbishop Abbot. Abbot had apparently not heard of Grotius' visit to James; he wanted merely to find out what Grotius was doing in theological affairs, as well as to try to explain away the Remonstrants' conclusion that James' letter had represented a victory for them. What he tells Grotius at this time is very likely what he was writing to his Counter-Remonstrant allies in Holland. He tells him, to begin with, that he has sent for him since Caron cannot understand the explanation that must be made of the true terms of the King's theological stand.

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 269.

He then asks Grotius point-blank what he thinks of Arminius.[1] Grotius answers that he wants to adopt no name of a faction, that in political and religious affairs he is inclined to peace, quite, and moderation. Abbot then said that the last letter from the King to the Estates had given a false impression in Holland; it was being taken as if the King now approved of the opinions of Arminius, whom he had formerly, and rightly, called an enemy of God. He (the King) still thinks the same. He tells Grotius, furthermore, that the last words of the letter should not be so interpreted as if the opinion (and here Grotius lapses into the Latin terms) "de praedestinatione propter fidem et opera praevisa de universale gratia, de libero arbitrio et quod iustificati aut sanctificati excidant aut totaliter aut finaliter" were a fundamental statement of any belief sufficient for salvation. Abbot tells him that he thinks it only right to explain these things to him, and that the King would do it himself at the proper time. Grotius must have smiled at this revelation that he had managed to steal a march on the doughty Archbishop. Perhaps it inspired him with the over-confidence that was to be his downfall. Grotius' answer was, he reports, that the Archbishop himself had quite possibly been wrongly informed about events in Holland, and that the news of the misinterpretation of the King's letter might well have come to him from prejudiced persons. Abbot answered that it had not been reported to him by any of the clergy, but by a person who did understand the question, and whom he could believe. Grotius notes here that he thinks Abbot meant Winwood, although he didn't say so. Grotius goes on to say that he tried to speak in favor of this observer, saying that sometimes even wise and good people can be badly informed. Grotius went on to say, he continues, that Arminius was dead now, and that thus it was no longer necessary to dispute his beliefs; the question now was what the differences were between the Remonstrants and the Counter-Remonstrants. He proceeds to state the position of the Remonstrants in a way that shows he has some hope of also winning over Abbot, even on theological grounds. He points out that the Remonstrants followed Melanchthon and Bullinger and other very learned men. He notes in passing that Francis Junius himself had held "quandam gratiam universalem". The Remonstrants do not teach the doctrine "universalem gratiam cum exclusione particularis" in the University,[1] nor do they teach "praedestinationem propter fidem, sed propter Christianum", although they taught "quod salus decernitur his quibus a Deo danda est fides et quod in explicando decrete dandae fidei minus permittunt humanae curiositati", that they furthermore did not teach "liberum arbitrium ad bonum salutare ante gratiam". And in the point of "perseverantia", even the teachings of Geneva and the French theologians allowed one to be free to doubt the extreme doctrine. He means, he said, that the addition of "in electis" in the Lambeth Article which reads "quod viva iustificans fides non extinguitur in electis finaliter", had not made a great deal of difference. The words "in electis", he points out, were only included after long deliberation, and the Bishops had been very reluctant to include the article as it had been written by Whitaker.[1]

---

[1] It is apparent that Abbot had been caught unawares by the fact that this commissioner who had arrived to deal on the question of the East Indies, had turned out to be a masked battery for the theological views of the Remonstrants. It explains the fulness of his letter to Winwood. This interview, of course, comes before he writes to Winwood.

---

[1] The letter is in Dutch, but at this point, as at others where I use the Latin phrases, Grotius lapses into Latin.

This seems to have stopped Abbot on this phase of the argument. Grotius was quoting to him the real doctrine of the English Church in opposition to the version of it that Abbot's friends, the High Calvinists, were engaged in trying to make the world believe was its doctrine. Abbot then shifted to a discussion of the views of the Counter-Remonstrants in church government, "wherein it was", says Grotius, "he opposed me the most." Grotius pointed out that the statement of the Remonstrants' position, of which the King had declared his approval, did not differ from their statement to the Estates General. The question, he said, was not of approving their opinions but only one of mutual tolerance, and on this question, "I thought His Majesty's advice to be very Christian and useful, considering the present state of affairs". He prayed, he said, that the King would continue to follow this course of moderation and moderate freedom, and not revive a new Papacy to punish some "rising spirits" too quickly. However, says Grotius, "as far as I could judge the man, I think that my discourse will not count much with him, since he has been imbued with an evil opinion of me". He falls back on his resolve to tell Andrewes (who has told Grotius his opinion "very freely") what has happened, and to ask him to influence the King in his thinking, and to get him to continue to show his support of the Remonstrants in his letters and in his personal declarations.

---

[1] As I have shown in Chapter V, Articuli Lambethani claimed that Whitaker's version had read "in iis qui semel ejus participes fuerunt". This is another argument for the genuineness of the book, for Grotius could only have got this information from Andrewes.

Abbot, after having been caught napping at first, apparently recovered rapidly, and made headway with the King against Grotius, for the next letter we have from Grotius reveals a growing bitterness over the policies of the English Church and the practises of Abbot. At any rate his interview with Abbot has somewhat dampened the enthusiasm with which he had come away from his first talk with James. He is more aware of the strength and power that is opposing him. It is written to Casaubon, who has gone out of town on a visit to Oxford[1] and is dated May 22d.[2] He has written him, says Grotius, [in a letter now lost] recently, what Abbot[3] is doing and intends. "Every day", he says, "I learn more [about his actions]." "This [scheming] bends all efforts, through a specious kind of interpretation, to ward off a decision which would tolerate those among us who in the question of Predestination prefer to imitate the sobriety of the Fathers, which is audacity for those doctors born more recently. Therefore [and his anger is here revealed in the explosive and involved style of his Latin] these are made dogmas: they [the Remonstrants] are those who resist the Holy Spirit, who have not opened to Christ's knocking, who make a shipwreck of the faith; what will he not dare to do if Canterbury becomes Rome? Thus it happens that by the words of the King applied to our people the sentiments of the Reverend [Bishop] of Ely [Andrewes], of the learned Dean [Overall], and of many pious men are condemned. Those men are the object of the attacks which are made on our men ("Per nostrorum latus illi petuntur") for how could the King retain in his church what he damns in a foreign one? I meanwhile am not remiss in the good cause, and am inciting [the Bishop of] Ely to use the liberty he ought. I am also instructing our ambassador to point out to the King how erect [triumphant] will be the crests of our Puritans (Cathari)[1] if those who favor them accomplish what they now are attempting to the utmost."

---

[1] Pattison, Casaubon, p. 397.
[2] Molhuysen, I, 239.
[3] He designates him in a Greek phrase.

Grotius was not to see Casaubon again. It is impossible to deduce from his letters whether he went back to Holland convinced that he had won James over, as appears from his report in the second part of this letter, or whether he went home convinced that all was lost, and that the Remonstrants might as well go on with their policy and let the chips fall where they might. The first part of this letter indicates the latter, as do his actions after he reaches Holland. He goes on:

---

[1] The Cathari were a heretical sect of the Middle Ages. Their tenet was that Satan is god of this temporal world, and the outward man is especially the body of death; there is no possibility of approach to God or salvation while in the body. This is a rather more accurate denomination for the Puritans than that of Stoics, which is used by Overall and others.

> Yesterday I said farewell to the King. When I was going he drew me aside and asked that I often inform him about the things which are done among us [I.e. in Holland]. This I promised to do, and in turn I begged him to persist in his faithful decision. He said that it seemed to him that the Archbishop did not sufficiently understand the matter. I added that it seemed the same to me, and that Abbot had thought me a heretic because I had praised the King's decision. The King laughed at this. I pressed this matter, saying that the Archbishop had promised to give the King another interpretation by which he hoped to be able to undo [the effect of] the King's letter. The King said that he [James] had said something about the interpretation itself, but thus far, as appeared, this has been his opinion, that he did not wish to render judgment on other questions than those contained in the exhibited writing itself. [Presumably the Five Articles sent to James by Oldenbarnevelt]. For he himself was no seer, to know what things besides those he had read were to be tolerated by the law. I tremble [resumes Grotius] vehemently at what that interpretation is to be and when it will be. For, mild as it can possibly be, nevertheless the King will seem to be throwing suspicion on the Laws as tending to ruin any other dogmas besides those necessary to salvation, which is far from the truth.[1] And this very removal of

---

[1] Grotius is talking here about the projected law for the settlement of the religious dispute, which Oldenbarnevelt is preparing for passage. This rather cryptic passage apparently means that if the interpretation James puts on this law seems mild and moderate, the King will seem to be suspicious of it, suspecting, that is, that they will outlaw any dogma not of the basic type necessary to salvation.

> Vorstius from his Professorship can testify to that. Therefore I should like at least to prevent that interpretation until I shall come back to Holland. For I consider that I have convinced the King about the orthodoxy of our leaders [he uses a Greek phrase here also] and that it now can be made clear to him that any interpretation will be not only superfluous, but also injurious. This task I should like to leave to you, if you return in time. I shall not see you now, a fact which troubles me. For, unless I am mistaken, we shall be off within two days; but letters will fill the place of talk, letters which I shall diligently send to you and avidly expect from you. May God spare you. May 12th, by the English calendar, Your most observing, H. Grotius.

Many of these phrases are cryptic, but it seems that Grotius is now much less confident that he can count on the King's staying on his course of favoring the Remonstrants. He seems to have heard something of the fact that James is considering another declaration which will ostensibly be in support of the new law, but which in reality will be no help at all. His only hope is to hold off that declaration until he gets back to Holland, for what purpose it is hard to tell. Perhaps he has already decided that he can blunt James' statement with another blast of his own; perhaps he already has the Ordinum in mind. He seems to be resigned here, at any rate, to the ascendancy of Abbot's influence.

Grotius' next letter to Casaubon, dated June 23d,[1] seems to indicate that James still had an open mind on the theological side of the subject. When Grotius had seen Uitenbogaert on his return to Holland, he had apparently carried to him a message from James to the effect that he [James] would be one of Uitenbogaert's admirers if he would drop the teachings of the Socinians. Uitenbogaert thereupon wrote Grotius a letter, which Grotius sent to Casaubon to be given to the King. Casaubon wrote Grotius in August that James had been much pleased at Uitenbogaert's rejection of the Socinian doctrines. He was also gratified by Uitenbogaert's condemnation of all strange doctrines, notably those of Vorstius, although he said he was surprised that the pastor had not previously investigated all the works of Vorstius.[1]

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, No. 273.

In September 1613 was published the Ordinum Hollandiae ac Westfrisiae Pietas ab Improbissimis multorum Calumniis, praesertim vero a nupera Sibrandi Lubberti Epistola quam ad reverendissimum Archiepiscopum Cantuarensem scripsit vindicata.[2]

With all my attempts thus far at explanation, the paradox still remains. Why, by the deliberate decision of the two men who knew better than anyone else exactly the danger of just such a book, was it published at just this time? Grotius certainly knew that he had succeeded with James only in so far as he had been able to divorce the King's attitude toward the Arminians from theological considerations. And Uitenbogaert, from his correspondence with James, must have been aware of it also.[1] Not much could be expected of Bertius in the line of political wisdom, but certainly Oldenbarnevelt must also have seen and approved it. The over-riding consideration may have been the fact that Lubbertus had continued his attack on the Arminians and kept citing Vorstius as typical of their position. In 1811 he had published his Letter to the States General, and his De Jesu Christo Salvatore, the latter dedicated to the Dutch congregation in London. In 1613 he wrote his Commentarii ad 99 Errores Conradi Vorstii, which he dedicated to Abbot in a prefatory letter.[2] Such sweeping attacks, they must have felt, could not possibly be left unanswered. But they did not need to be answered in the way Grotius did. Although he had disavowed Vorstius to James while he was in England, he now begins by a long defence of him, an attack on all who have criticized him, and then goes on to link the Arminian tenets in theology inextricably with the whole Vorstius question.

---

[1] Professor Hyma cites Uitenbogaert's Kerckelijcke Historie, Part IV, p. 67. - a letter which is not in Molhuysen's collection.

[2] J. Paets, Leyden, 1613, in two editions. There was a Dutch edition at the Hague, and a French edition at Leyden in the same year. It was printed in Hugonis Grotii Operum Theologicorum, Amsterdam, 1679, four volumes, III, 99-125.

The two possible explanations for this phenomenon are, first, extreme overconfidence, and second, complete loss of hope of ever having James' help. I do not think we have enough evidence to decide which is true. Professor Hyma tends to the former explanation. Grotius, he says, made such a bitter attack on Lubbertus because he "was under the impression that Lubbertus and his followers could no longer count on support from England". But the tone of discouragement in his final letter to Casaubon from England about the alternatives facing him and the Remonstrants, and about the influence of Abbot, would make me think that Grotius might well have given up any hope of final support from England altogether. It is obvious that Grotius counted too much on the influence of his friends in England; he may have thought that this bold attack on Lubbertus, and the full delineation of the whole issue would bring them into action on his side. Like too many intellectuals, especially at his time, he had a naive trust in the powers of reason to convince men of the truth. It may have been merely a continuation of the quixotism which had cost them so dear at the beginning of the affair. Decision on the motives behind the Ordinum must await further evidence.

---

[1] Uitenbogaert made the translation into Dutch; Naeranus, the preacher at Hazerswoude, into French.

[2] The letter appeared in a Dutch translation at Delft in the same year. Lubbertus was professor at Franeker in Frisia, the center of High Calvinism for all Europe at the time. William Ames went there as professor when he left England, and the first president of Harvard was one of its graduates.

In one comment he makes on the Ordinum in a letter to Heinsius in October of 1613, Grotius seems to say that English theology was the largest influence in his writing. He may, however, here be speaking of the law which the Estates of Holland were about to promulgate. He says, after mentioning "libello meo", the Ordinum:

> Remonstrantium dogmata toleranda esse dico nimirum post tot Ordinum decreta eam in rem facta: post intellectam praestantissimorum in Anglia Theologorum sententiam: qui ita existimant, in primo capite partem antiquitatis, in caeteris omnem antiquitatem ab illis stare: ac si altera partium condemnanda foret, existimant instius hoc ei parte eventurum quae licet invita attamen incredulita-

> tis humanae causas Deo adscribit, et studium pietatis mirum in modum refrigerat. Ita sentiunt illi in Anglia quos nos ex Casauboni testimonio maximi facimus. [1]

He goes on to speak of his other book on the power of Princes (which I shall discuss later) and comments: "Quin Archiepiscopus et Winwodus arripuerunt eam occasionem, ut libro meo odium apud Regem concitarent, dubium non habeo." But he hopes that when the King considers it by himself, and consults the most learned theologians of his "aulae", he will think differently.

The etiquette of dedications in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries indicates that Lubbertus' dedication of his latest book to Abbot was not unknown to, or undesired by, the object.[2] It was worth something in itself as propaganda, as the publication of the preface alone in Dutch would indicate. Some sort of counter-propaganda was needed. And this Grotius supplies. He cites the item about the Lambeth Articles that he had cited to Abbot,[3] and assembles all the evidence he can from English sources to show that the English Church doctrine holds that there can be differing sentiments on predestination within the Church. He also quotes James, of course.

Lubbertus' book had in fact reached England while Grotius was there. James had produced it in the same interview which Grotius described to Casaubon.[1] Grotius had then taken the correct position, it seems, to counteract its effect on James. What makes him describe this discussion with James is Casaubon's letter of October 10th, in which Casaubon reveals that he, of all people, has read Lubbertus' book with approval, and also communicates the shocking news that a manuscript of the Ordinum has already got into the hands of Abbot. The ineffable Bertius had sent it to him! Casaubon writes on October 10th:

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 272.
[2] Casaubon always made careful inquiries of the persons to whom he wished to dedicate a book.
[3] Page 107.

> We have seen the book by Sibrandus against Vorstius, of which we strongly approve. A manuscript has been brought to the king, which he doubts not has been written by you. I have read a few pages of it, and I can tell easily that it is your production. [2]

On October 23d Grotius replies to Casaubon's letter, making a direct appeal to the old man to recall to James the arguments Grotius had used against Lubbertus in their interview. He ends by asking Casaubon to recommend him to the King, "And if it be necessary, and you can do it in good conscience, and it is sufficiently safe, protect both myself and the States." He seems almost to have given up.

The King had sent for him on that occasion, he tells

---

[1] The only evidence that this was the same interview is from deduction. The letter which Grotius refers to his having written Casaubon before may have spoken about the King's citing this book of Lubbertus'. It is nowhere stated how many times Grotius saw the King, but it seems conclusive that it was only twice. The bitterness he shows over the tactics of Abbot at the beginning of this letter to Casaubon may come from his having seen this book. But he waits until later to tell Casaubon about it. Why he did this I cannot say.

[2] Molhuysen, I, No. 290.

Casaubon,[1] and Grotius had explained to him that "our zealots have caused the controversy over Vorstius to get entangled in the question of predestination, and they have sought to cast odium [upon us] through it." Grotius says he has only tried to defend the solution of this matter by the Estates of Holland from calumnies. He has continued to urge that James indicate ("that it should be signified in the public name of Majesty himself") that the Ordinances of Holland are completely free of any favor towards the Socinian errors. He points out that dissidents in the matter of predestination were tolerated even by Calvin himself, and that this persecution of them is something new in our day. It was at this point, he goes on, that the King produced Lubbertus' book against Vorstius and showed Grotius that the preface accused the 'Ordines' of being Socinian. Grotius' answer was that "no one defends Vorstius but Vorstius", he is only the whip used to beat the "Ordinum Hollandiae". If this confusion of the two questions is allowed to continue, he says (choosing shrewdly the one argument which James would listen to above all others), you will soon see disturbances in the republic, the people disobedient, the clergy masters of civil affairs, "magistrates sent under the yoke".

He now makes the best of the fact that the Ordinum Pietas has got into England. These are the causes, he says to Casaubon, which made me write the little book of which I understand the manuscript has already come into England. This book, he goes one, "now bolstered by public authority, certainly shows that the Ordines are far from Socinian."

---

[1] In letter No. 272 he had told Casaubon that he had discussed the case of Vorstius with James, and that he (Grotius) had defended him. This may refer to this same interview or to another. It is impossible to say. This letter is No. 294, Molhuysen I, 269.

Lubbertus' dedicatory letter to Abbot had been phrased in terms calculated to appeal to James. He said:

> After certain persons had introduced into the church the heresies of Servetus and Socinus, in order to undermine and turn upside down the most prosperous churches in the United Provinces, and when the churches wept...the king of England, burning with heroic zeal, warned the States General through his ambassador that they should exclude that heretic, who taught so many heresies, from the profession. Not satisfied with this, the king issued his excellent writings in which he exposed the heresies and showed that those who induced the curators at Leyden to appoint Vorstius should be ashamed of themselves. Thus the greatest of all princes showed that he was not only a defender of the faith in word but also in deed. 1

He went on to invoke the long relations between Holland and England, how much Elizabeth had done for the Dutch after the assassination of William the Silent, and the reverence shown the king's daughter when she had travelled through the Netherlands to join her husband in Germany.

In the Ordinum Pietas Grotius repeats the arguments he used with James, but the context of his defence of Vorstius makes them appear sophistical. We may be sure that Abbot could make good use of his observation that the Estates cannot be blamed for the dismissal of Vorstius, for the King of England forced them to it. Or his comment that Lubbertus

---

1 Translated by Professor Hyma.

"should have included the fact that the King has such a strong desire to maintain the peace of the church that he tolerates the various opinions in his country with long suffering and moderation".

On November 11th Grotius writes to Bertius in surprisingly moderate terms. He had written to Uitenbogaert in anger on October 22d, saying that an inquiry must be held on how their secrecy has been violated,[1] but since it turned out to be one of their inner circle he has had to be mollified. He tells Bertius that by prudent advice he had changed certain things in the book as Bertius had it, and had taken out certain things which he had not given enough thought to before. But now it was too late. Perhaps he had been going to make the alterations which would have kept James in line. He had been most afraid, he goes on, that it might reach the King through Winwood or the Archbishop, and be given a prejudiced aspect and evil interpretation by them. Now, he says, Erpenius has relieved his anxiety, having reported, from a conversation with Andrewes, that there was no cause for worry. He feels, says Grotius, that he has the direction of divine Providence, and that the King will remember his arguments when he was with him, and finally arrive at a just position. He says, apprehensively, however, in closing, that he would be much more firmly persuaded of this if the letters he awaits from

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, No. 293.

England would carry a milder judgment of his book than that which he learns the Counter-Remonstrants are giving of it every day.

Erpenius, a famous Orientalist of the time, who was to become professor at Leyden in December, 1613, had just passed through England, and had sought out Andrewes, as almost any scholar must, on his way. From the reference in the letter it is apparent that Grotius had hastened to interview him when he arrived from England:

> Besides what I told you in confidence I have learned nothing about your book in England. The Bishop of Ely asked me whether I had heard of a certain book which Dr Grotius had written against Sibrandus: to which I made as if I had also heard of it, but that it had not yet come out. Then he said 'The King read it and told me that this one thing in the whole he wondered at, that Grotius asserted not coldly but audaciously and in eloquent words that among the bishops in Holland, even the Papists, there had never been one who had political power. If that were true it is certainly worthy of admiration, and peculiar to Holland alone'. From which conversation we fell into talk on other Bishops *in Belgio* but I did not get from all this the impression that the King was displeased with your book. 1

He has no doubt, he says, that Andrewes or Casaubon has written to Grotius about it before this, since it was already three weeks ago.

It must have been exasperating to Grotius to have so vague a report on what was now a matter of such moment to

---

1 The letter is dated November 2d. Molhuysen I, 277-278, No. 301. James is, of course, here beginning the line of objection to Remonstrant policy which he is going to follow later on - that Bishops had no political power would mean that the civil power had too much in matters of religion.

him. The total evidence seems to point to the fact that Andrewes has definitely ceased to take any part at all in the controversy, if, indeed, he had ever supported Grotius at all. I cannot imagine that Andrewes would not realize the part this book played in the situation, and perhaps he had himself been alienated by it. He may well have realized also that Erpenius would certainly be interrogated by Grotius, and have "planted" this little single morsel of information as a quiet Episcopal practical joke.[1]

On October 31st Grotius had written to Heinsius the comment about his fears of the machinations of Abbot and Winwood which I quoted above. On December 12th he writes again to Casaubon expressing his concern about the results of the Ordinum in England, saying he hopes soon to receive news of it and of Casaubon's opinion of it.[2] On December

---

[1] It is very unlikely that Andrewes did not know the issues, or indeed that he did not know more about the situation abroad than most people in England. He seems to have had one of the best private intelligence systems of the time, especially for foreign news of Catholic converts. He seems to have had a close friendship with Sir Dudley Carleton, which may perhaps not be without significance in this whole affair. John Chamberlain writes to Carleton on February 12, 1611/12 (The Court and Times of James I, I, 174) to inform him that the two Carmelite converts Carleton had told him about had arrived in England. He adds: "Their reception could not be so private as it seems you wished, for they were expected long before they came, and the Bishop of Ely could tell me two months since that there were two such upon the way, which it seems was some time before they set forth. He told me likewise this other day of a certain bishop in the Venetian territory, (but he had forgot his name) that is writing a work against the Pope's usurping jurisdiction." (This was, of course, Mark Antonio de Dominis, Bishop of Spalatro, who has already been mentioned, and whom we will have cause to mention again.)

[2] Molhuysen, I, 284-285, No. 308.

19th he finally got his report from Casaubon, and it was not encouraging. James has reversed himself completely, and now warns Grotius through Casaubon that the solution that Grotius envisions for Holland attributes more power to the civil magistrate than they themselves demand in England.[1] This was the final blow to the point that Grotius had considered his strong suit. Grotius' realization of this fact is seen in the somewhat hopeless tone of his answer. He still ventures to say that the King might not find the book so obnoxious if he had leisure to examine it more closely. He will, he says, still defend Vorstius, even though much he says displeases James; he is sure that Vorstius is no Socinian.

Abbot and Winwood had, it seems, found an argument in the British constitution to upset Grotius' best one. James had called Winwood home from Holland in August, 1613, to be the new Secretary of State. As such his principal task was to deal with the new Parliament ("the addled Parliament") which was to open the next April.[2] Since the beginning of James' reign, Parliament had been demanding the right to legislate on affairs of religion, a claim which was the center of all the political quarrels right up to the Revolution. It may be said to be, in fact, the real issue on which the war was fought. Grotius' arguments are for the powers of Kings, but the Estates, to which he wishes to give this power, is a parliament. If James supports this argument as Grotius has drawn it out he will be open to the charge that he supports principles in the Netherlands which he opposes at home. There is no doubt that Winwood and Abbot pointed this out to James.

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 287-289, No. 310.

[2] See Gardiner, II, 232 ff. Also Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church, I, 340 ff.

Grotius marshals his precedents for James to Casaubon from British sources. He says:

> I attribute to the King what [power] Jewel attributes to him in his most eloquent book, no more, which is, as Bilson says in brief: 'examination and decision in the actions of moderating and reforming ministers', or, as the Anglican Canons [of 1604][1] say; 'that authority in ecclesiastical causes which pious Princes among the Jews, and Christian Emperors in the primitive Church obtained,' which the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 'which appeared in England,' explains thus: 'that that King might be thus Supreme governor after God, was not repugnant to any divine word in the statutes and customs of the kingdom.' In which book are also these words: 'Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is plainly the king's, a primary and especially indivisible part of the crown and royal dignity: ecclesiastical laws are royal laws, nor are they elsewhere to be found nor otherwise sustained or supported than with Ecclesiastical judges; Ecclesiastical jurisdiction stands through archbishops and bishops, derived from the royal power. To thee God has committed the kingdom, to others thou has entrusted the things of the Church.'

Grotius emphasized the point that he means this opinion to be considered not in the light of the whole catholic church, but of the particular church of a particular kingdom, not of that spiritual body which is the kingdom of Christ alone, but as relating to something eternal which is also public.

---

[1] James' memories of the battle over the Canons of 1604 must have made this argument singularly ineffective.

The argument is a long one, and learned, but he must have known it was no use. The peculiar political conditions in England had given James a way out, and the Remonstrants were to suffer for it.

Meanwhile, however, Grotius had been at work upon a document which he hoped would erase the bad impression of the Ordinum Pietas. In January, 1614, the Estates of Holland adopted a Resolution for Peace in the Churches, (over the protests of Amsterdam, Enkhuizen, and Edam,) which by general consent at the time was held to be the work of Grotius.[1]

---

[1] Resolutie Van de Doorluchtige Moghende Heeren Staten van Hollandt ende West-Vriesland tot den Vrede der Kercken, the Hague, 1614. Knuttel, No. 2110. It was printed with a commentary, which was also, says Professor Hyma, largely the work of Grotius. A Latin translation appeared the same year at Leyden.
The Resolution said (in part): "Inasmuch as many quarrels have originated in the church of these lands from the different interpretations of some texts in the Bible which treat of God's eternal predestination, and with the result that some are said to teach that God has created certain persons for eternal damnation, and that He has compelled man to commit sin; while others say that man can obtain salvation through his own works, both causing calumny to the Reformed Christian religion, - therefore we must take steps to promote the honor of God, prosperity within the churches, and peace in the congregations....We accept the authority which God's Word and the examples of princes and republics which have accepted the Reformation have given us. We therefore command that everyone take heed of the warning of Paul that no one must think more highly than is becoming to him, but modestly in accordance with the amount of faith that has been bestowed upon him, and as the Scriptures teach, that our salvation comes from God alone, but that we bring ill-fortune to ourselves. Consequently all preachers must teach their respective congregations that the salvation of man and also his faith must not be ascribed to his own merits but to the grace of God in Christ; that God is not the originator of sin, and that He does not call anyone to salvation

---

whom He has decided to condemn. Although among the scholars in our university and among our preachers there is a difference of opinion on these points, and although we do not wish to restrict the liberty to discuss them in a friendly manner, we nevertheless understand that such discussions may not be given from the pulpit nor held among the common people. We also desire that those may not be molested who believe that God from eternity according to his own pleasure, grounded in Christ, has elected those to salvation who through grace of the Holy Ghost believe in Jesus, and through faith persevere in this faith; and on the contrary has rejected those who do not believe and do not persevere in the faith; believing this doctrine sufficient for salvation and suitable for edification. We further order that all preachers shall expound the other articles of faith according to God's word and to the doctrines that have been accepted in general in the Reformed Churches in these lands; and that they shall be bound by our former resolutions for the avoidance of further discussions."

The Commentary which accompanied the Leyden edition, had twenty heads. Professor Hyma, to whom I am indebted for the translation of the passages which appear here, says that much of the material contained in this commentary was the result of Grotius' trip to England.

The Heads are these:

1. That the government of a state is entitled to the requisite authority for maintaining order by extinguishing false doctrines and ecclesiastical dissensions.
2. Moderation must be the guiding motive.
3. That our salvation comes from God alone, but that we bring upon ourselves ill-fortune.
4. The beginning, progress, and end of the salvation of man must not be ascribed to the natural powers of the human being but to the grace of God.
5. That especially also faith must not be ascribed to the natural powers of the human being but to the grace of God.
6. That all of this must be deemed the function of the grace of God.
7. That grace, to which we must ascribe all these things, is not merited.
8. That this grace of God is in Christ.
9. That the Almighty God created no man for damnation.
10. No human being is caused by God to sin.
11. That God does not invite any human being to partake of salvation to whom He has not definitely decided to grant salvation.
12. That the election of God is from eternity.
13. That the election of God is in accordance with His pleasure.
14. That election is founded on Christ.
15. Those are elected who believe on Christ.

He notifies Casaubon of it on April 20th,[1] enclosing a copy, and says he has also written to Overall about it. He is very anxious, of course, that it shall have the approbation of King James. Casaubon said in his letter of May 6th that he had received a copy: "I have read the document...and I have noted here and there a few passages which I wished they had phrased differently....I cannot praise the Estates enough for having put a check to the theologians who with their boundless curiosity wish to pry into the secrets of God, and thereby cause the wretched squabbles in the churches. The ancient church firmly believed that there were many mysterious points in the Christian religion which ought not to be discussed, especially before the common people."[2] On May 30th Casaubon reports that the King, Abbot, and other leaders have approved of it, and that they hope it will soon be the source of peace in the church. They too feel, he reports, that some of the phrasing is open to criticism and (what must have made Grotius realize that his battle for the full support of James has been lost) its theory of affording to the civil magistrate the determining power in religious affairs is one which cannot command the assent of the King of England.[3]

---

16. Those are elected who persevere in the faith until the end.
17. That a human being perseveres in the faith through unmerited grace.
18. That those are rejected who do not believe, and persevere in this unbelief until the end.
19. That this confession is sufficient unto salvation and adequate for Christian edification.
20. That everyone ought to adhere to Christian love, unity, and charity in order to avoid dissensions.

[1] Molhuysen, I, No. 346.
[2] Ibid., p. 311, No. 335.
[3] Ibid., pp. 316-317, No. 342.

The succeeding letters go into this question at more length, but the answers that James returned to Grotius through Casaubon were firm, and Grotius must have known that any support that the Remonstrants could count on from that quarter was lost. And he must by now have realized also that, however much sympathy he may have got from the English theologians in his attack on High Calvinism, when it came to the combination of theological questions with political ones, they would not support him. I shall discuss the doctrinal aspect of the situation later; meanwhile we may conclude that by this time the Remonstrants knew that they must carry on alone, and that the best they could hope for from England was a neutral stand.

Just what a shipwreck the Ordinum represented for Grotius' hopes is described very accurately in a letter dated December 3, 1613, published by Jacobus Triglandus, one of the leaders of the Counter-Remonstrants, in 1650.[1] He does not identify the writer, beyond saying that it is a learned man in England, but its analysis of the situation and its results is so pat, and the sentiments and estimate it attributes to Abbot so natural that there can be no doubt of its genuineness. It reads:

> Very learned Sir.
> The letter by Sibrandus, written on November 5th, I have received late. As soon as I had received it I went to the Archbishop, who cordially accepted your greetings and spoke with pleasure about you. He said that he replied by letter to Dr Sibrandus, thanking him in a letter transmitted by the ambassador of the King, praising the

---

[1] Professor Hyma reprints it from Trigland's Kerckelycken Geschiedenissen, pp. 671-672.

> zeal of Sibrandus. Casaubon has told me that Sibrandus has accomplished a very useful task for the church, for he hates the heresies condemned by the church. He is very sorry, however, that the invective of Grotius [Ordinum Pietas] was published. He likes the style but not the contents, nor the manner in which the subject-matter is treated. The king wishes to make known that he dislikes this composition by Grotius, and for these two reasons: First, because he defends Vorstius in great detail, saying that those who prohibited him from teaching in the university and accused him of heresy, sinned through their bias. Secondly, because he ascribes to the government more power than it deserves and more than the king has ever felt that it should receive. Many other things the king has noted in this work that displeased him ....The Archbishop now sees fully what he had suspected from the beginning, namely, that Grotius was sent to England to study conditions in the church over there, to keep that which suited him in the matter concerning predestination.
>
> Grotius has not done justice to the Church of England. He has been informed that the king will not permit that his letter which the Hollanders have printed is to be so construed as if to imply that the Arminian doctrine of predestination may be taught in the Reformed churches. The king's intention had been very different indeed....I think I see a young and inexperienced fighter descend into the battlefield to take up arms against an old, experienced, and capable soldier. I inform Sibrandus that I shall receive with much pleasure his reply to the invective of Grotius. I have not seen the manuscript copy of Grotius for it is now in the hands of the king. My compliments to you, most eminent sir.

The reply of Lubbertus was Sibrandi Lubberti Responsio ad Pietatem Hugonis Grotii, which was banned by the Estates of Holland on October 17th, 1614, with thanks rendered in the same resolution to the good offices of Grotius. He answered it with Bona fides Sibrandi Lubberti. About this book Casaubon wrote with disarming inconsistency:

> I have read your book with the greatest pleasure. In several years there has not appeared a more

> elegant book which is more applicable to these times and is more worthy of perusal in my opinion. I hope that you will write many more such works.[1]

The Counter-Remonstrants knew their victory, even though Grotius seems to have been slow in coming to full awareness of his defeat. He became increasingly aware of it as time went on, and the new Ambassador, Sir Dudley Carleton, swung the influence of England even more strongly behind the Counter-Remonstrant demand for a National Synod.

Casaubon died in July, 1614, and Grotius' only correspondents in England thereafter, as far as we know, are Overall and the Archbishop of Spalatro, and there is only one letter extant from the latter. Overall remained his only dependable friend in England. It is clear from their correspondence that Grotius has not given up his hope of eventually enlisting the support of the English Church. He makes theology the whole subject of his correspondence with Overall. He also tries to find out more about the Lambeth Articles on which he had found such differing views when he was in England. On October 25, 1615 John Bingham writes him the letter about them which I have already mentioned in a previous chapter.[2] That he is gathering knowledge from other sources about the same events is shown by his ability to correct the date given him by Bingham.

---

[1] Molhuysen, p. 282, No. 305. Professor Hyma points out that Brandt is wrong in saying that Casaubon wrote this about the Ordinum. The 1679 edition of Grotius' theological works also prints this comment as if it had been applied to the Ordinum. Professory Hyma is right, however.

[2] Molhuysen, I, pp. 413-415, No. 425. Molhuysen cites a John Bingham who was in 1604 a lieutenant-colonel in the

By 1617, affairs were coming to a head in the Netherlands. James had swung back into full support of the Counter-Remonstrants, and Carleton was pressing hard for a Synod, which the Remonstrants knew would be their ruin. Grotius writes to Overall on July 9, 1617, that the controversies about predestination were breaking more and more into schism, and that the authority of James was being more and more claimed by the Counter-Remonstrants for their demands.[1] Carleton's backing of the Counter-Remonstrants is apparent from his letters at the time.[2] On October 6th, Carleton made a speech in the Estates General in which he vigorously attacked the Remonstrants, saying that the root of the whole trouble lay in the Arminian heresy, and that the only solution was in a National Synod which was being opposed only by the States of Holland and the Remonstrants. It seems that the Remonstrants are the persecutors, from his recital. He piously disclaims any intention of playing "the basic body *in aliena Republica* therinto to Iudge how much euery Prouince in particular ought in such occasions to yeeld to the publike."[3]

---

regiment of Robert Drake in the Netherlands. *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees...University of Cambridge, 1544 to 1649* (J., and J. A. Venn, Cambridge, 1913), lists four John Binghams who could have been about his time.

[1] Molhuysen, I, p. 574, No. 519.

[2] Notably in *The Court and Times of James I*, II, 11, 31-32.

[3] *The Speech of Sir Dudley Carleton...Made in the Assembly of the Lords of the Estates Generall...Touching the Discord and Troubles of the Church and Policies, caused by the Schismaticall Doctrine of Arminius, Exhibited the 6 of October, 1617.*, London, 1618.

James has foretold the trouble they would be in if this dissension were not put an end to, he says. The Articles of the Union of Utrecht that every province has power in matters of religion "ought to be understood soundly for the maintenance of the pure and sincere Religion and not for the authorisation and allowance of new and strange opinions". Translated into Dutch, this speech caused a sensation. Grotius complains about it bitterly in a letter to the Archbishop of Spalatro. He had tried to argue Carleton out of giving the speech in a conference he had with him before it, and he was now the author of the letter of protest that the Estates sent to James. Meanwhile Grotius is apparently circulating some letters of Andrewes' to prove that the Lambeth Articles and High Calvinism are not the doctrine of the Church of England. Andrewes in his reply to Chamberlain,[1] who, on the part of Carleton, has been sent to warn him off of any support of the Arminians, assumes that what is in question is his opinion of the Lambeth Articles. As Chamberlain goes on to tell of his interview with Andrewes, it appears that the Bishop is all too eager to get out of appearing to be at all sympathetic with Grotius. After protesting that he had given away only one copy of the observations on the Articles, and that to Hooker, Andrewes goes on, in Chamberlain's report:

> But he [Andrewes] expressed not all the while which opinion he inclined to, but still in-

---

[1] Which I have already quoted at length above, Chapter IV, pp. 96-97.

> sisted, if they had any writing of his, they should show it, concluding that I should assure you that they have no letter of his, and with that vehemency, that he would give me leave to send you his head in a platter, if they could show any letter of his. He told me further, that Grotius, when he was here dined once with him, and supped another time; but other communication than passed at table he had none with him, though he understands since, that he gave out and fathered many things upon him that were neither so nor so. Surely he hath a wonderful memory, for he not only calls to mind any matter that passed at any time, but the very time, place, persons, and all other circumstances, which seemed strange to me, in a discourse of almost two hours. The next day he had invited a Dutchman, one Hoste, as I take it, of Amsterdam. I think his father to be one of the States. The man is toward forty years old and seems a good scholar, and had travelled. He told the Bishop, that the states had made a reasonable answer to the king's letter, but, by the cunning or power of Barnevelt and two or three more, it was suppressed, and not sent. [1]

Grotius commonly made a practice of passing on the letters he received from England to other correspondents of his, apparently not only in a friendly way, but also as a propaganda device. In writing to Vossius on March 14, 1618 he says he is sending him a letter from the Bishop of Lichfield, and comments: "It shames us to use this kind of arms, but you see in what century we are living."[2] That this was his common practice is indicated by his earlier comment to Vossius in a long letter in which Grotius summarized many points of view on predestination: "What the learned men think in England you may know from the letters of Lichfield and Casaubon...."[3] This may well have been the reason why

---

[1] The Court and Times of James I, II, 47, October 31, 1617.
[2] Molhuysen, I, 609, No. 564.
[3] Ibid., p. 557, No. 498. Overall is, of course ,the Bishop of Lichfield here.

Andrewes never wrote to Grotius. These documents ascribed to Andrewes, whatever they were, were apparently a strong enough propaganda weapon to worry Carleton, for on February 14th of 1618, Chamberlain writes again:

> I made an errand to Ely House, to have shown the bishop the pope's determination 'twixt the Franciscans and Jacobins, if he had not seen it; as likewise what you wrote concerning Grotius, to make him, at least, more wary hereafter, though, for aught I ever heard, he hath used caution enough that way.... 1

And exactly a week later, he writes again:

> I went again this week to my Lord of Ely, and had some speech with him concerning Grotius, from whom he confesses he had letters lately, and that, before Christmas one came to him for an answer; but, being presently to preach at court, and not finding himself well at ease, he made his excuse. But I perceive by this that he holds him for a very learned and able man; yet I doubt not but this little conference will serve him for a caveat hereafter. I lent him the Pope's determination 'twixt the Franciscans and Jacobins, and the censure of the Sorbonists upon the Archbishop of Spalatro's books, which I met with all by chance, neither of which he had seen. 2

It is evident that Carleton is practising intimidation here, since Chamberlain does not mention going to Andrewes' in the rest of his reports to the ambassador. The influence of Grotius' revelation of English theology was perhaps having too strong an effect in the Netherlands for Carleton's comfort.

The war continued between the two forces. It was claimed at the time of Grotius' trial that he had tried to

---

[1] The Court and Times of James I, II, 63.

[2] Ibid., p. 66. See below, p. 365, note 2.

have Carleton removed as Ambassador. In the rather cringing letter which Grotius wrote to Maurice just before his arrest in 1618, he claimed that he did not really want him removed, but that it had been his wish merely to have also in the country an able English theologian who could understand what was going on in the churches.[1] Perhaps he had mentioned Andrewes as a good person to send, which may explain the surveillance of Andrewes by Carleton's agent in London. Within a few weeks of Carleton's speech there was published the Weegschaal or Balance[2] which Carleton charged had been written by one Taurinus with the help of Grotius. At any rate it contained a copy of one of Grotius' letters to Casaubon. He wrote James about it, and demanded that the Estates suppress it. The mild edict that the Estates passed against it was not satisfactory to Carleton. James wrote Carleton that he himself had been indirectly attacked in the book. The Counter-Remonstrant answer to the Weegschaal was written by Johan Casimir Junius, who says that the author of the Weegschaal is a learned and dangerous person who should be carefully watched by the federal government. It accuses him of making trouble between the Estates General and the king of England, and invokes the influence of James to demand again the convening of a National Synod.

All this fatal summer Grotius continues to exchange letters with Overall, trying still to get some sentiment in England which may influence James to remove the pressure. Overall of course can offer him little but sympathy, and Andrewes, as we have seen, has been drawn off by Carleton's intimidation. On July 9th,[1] Grotius sends Overall another book, his de Imperio summarum Potestatum circa sacra, which he begs Overall to read and give his opinion on. He also asks him to get Andrewes' opinion on the book. Overall's answer on August 23d acknowledges receipt of the book and says he will transmit it to Andrewes.[2] He reports that he has had to go to Coventry to put down a Puritan rebellion about kneeling in his diocese, that Andrewes has been with the King in Scotland, but that he will send the book to Andrewes in London. On October 5th he reports that he has given the book to Andrewes when they had met in Coventry on the King's arrival there.[3] Andrewes, however is not to be drawn into the quarrel again. He has told Overall that he cannot read the book at the moment without showing it to James, and he wants Overall first to ascertain from Grotius that this would have his approval. This is of course exactly the reason why Grotius wants Andrewes to read the book, and Andrewes must have known it. Overall told Andrewes, according to his report to Grotius, that he hadn't been specifically told by Grotius that he didn't object to the King's seeing it, but that he was sure that it would be all right. Andrewes, however, still demurs, saying that he would like to wait for a letter from Grotius to that effect, lest, as in the case of Uitenbogaert's book,[1] it be turned against him. "When I added", says Overall, "that I doubted not that it would be easily approved by His Serene Highness because it was so learnedly written in favor of the power of the authorities, he said that His Majesty did not claim for himself nor approve in other lay powers, the power by themselves to judge sacred or divine things; especially those of the catholic faith. These he would rather commit to certain erudite theologians and other men learned in these affairs for their approval, and finally confirm them by authority."[2] Overall reports that he found Andrewes adamant against further argument. Overall thinks that there is little in Grotius' book of which Andrewes and "our other doctors" would not approve, "unless" he adds, "it be perhaps in those statements which seem to attribute the definitive decision about the things of faith to the lay powers, deny the true power and jurisdiction of the pastors of the church, and place the Episcopacy among things not necessary". This array seems to be enough to give almost any Bishop pause. Overall goes on to outline the way the English church believed the things of faith should be defined, and the difference between it and younger churches on the powers of presbyters and such subjects; the letter trails off into scholarly definitions which, we may assume, would only be discouraging to Grotius in the midst of so many signs of approaching crisis.

---

[1] Professor Hyma says that this letter has been published in English translation in H. Vreeland's Hugo Grotius, pp. 92-106.

[2] Professor Hyma notes that the University of Michigan has copies of three separate editions of this work. Knuttel, Nos. 2366, 2367, 2368.

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 574, No. 519. This was the day on which the Counter-Remonstrants took over the Cloister Church in the Hague and held it by force against the Remonstrants. Two weeks later Maurice signified his acceptance of the leadership of the Counter-Remonstrants by attending their services there!

[2] Molhuysen, I, 577, No. 526.

[3] Molhuysen, No. 539.

---

[1] Molhuysen identifies this book as the Tractaet van t' Ampt end Authoriteyt eener Hoogher Christelichen Overheydt in Kerckelicke Saecken, 1610, which had apparently helped to turn James against the Remonstrants. The British Museum Index Catalogue of Royal and King's MSS. (Volume III, 1921) lists an English translation of this work: "A Treatise of the office, power and authoritie off a Soveraigne Christian Magistrate in matters ecclesiasticall: a translation by I.D., one of the preachers to the English forces in the United Province, resident in Utrecht..." No. 17 B xliv. It is not dated, although the catalogue identifies it as of the time of Charles I.

[2] Page 590.

In answer, on October 30th,[1] Grotius writes that he is also sending along a book he has written against the Socinians. He is writing, he says, to Andrewes, to ask him formally if he will read and correct the book "de iure imperii" which Andrewes had so artfully dodged, even if it has to be with the knowledge of the King. He has appealed, he says, both to Andrewes[2] and to Spalatro about the state of things in Holland, which have now been aggravated by the recent oration of the King's ambassador. The question contained in the book must be treated because some have libellously attributed to him sentiments on this subject which he does not at all hold. His tone is now bitter. By the King's authority the better sentiments on grace and free-will are being oppressed in Holland, and schism is being promoted.

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 593-595, No. 543.

[2] This is the letter Andrewes, in his conversation with Chamberlain, refers to his having received, and not answered. (See above, p. 361). It is obvious that Chamberlain's visits were for the purpose of intimidating Andrewes.

In addressing the Bishop of Spalatro, Grotius was clutching at a straw. Spalatro had arrived in England only in 1616 and he was to be enticed back again to Rome in 1622. He was a trophy for James while he was in England, but his personal ambition and the growing force of the High Calvinist theology progressively alienated him from the English Church.[1] We have only the one letter to him from Grotius preserved, but they had apparently had some correspondence before this time, for in a letter to Vossius a few days before this one, Grotius had reported that Spalatro had just sent him four of the ten books of his de Regimine Ecclesiae, and a letter in which he professed himself grieved over the Dutch schism "especially on such small causes". Grotius begs Spalatro to say what he can in behalf of the Remonstrants about the quarrel which is rending the church.

At this time of feverish activity, one of the measures Grotius had decided upon was the despatch of one Hoofdius, to explain to the English once again the true state of affairs in Holland. He announces Hoofdius' coming in his letters to Overall and Spalatro. To Overall he says that Hoofdius will give him eye-witness evidence of "who among us are acting depravedly and perniciously under the title of piety." At the same time he recommends reading to Overall which would set forth the position of the Arminians better than those Overall had seen, among them Arminius'

---

[1] See The Life...of Antonio de Dominis, by Henry Newland, Oxford and London, 1859.

Examen Modestum written against Perkins, and Nicolai Grevinchoven's book against Ames. He enters also upon a defence of his book. His comments are sharper than is usual with him in writing to Overall. He is trying to get across to Overall and Andrewes the political threat involved in the principles being advocated by the Counter-Remonstrants.

Overall writes to Grotius on February 21, 1618[1] of his grief that Hoofdius' mission has been in vain, but, he says: "I am glad at the same time in part, since I have been informed by him of the greater concord and Christian tolerance among you." And it is apparent from what he goes on to say that the division has been felt also in England. He says: "But among us who are now treated hostilely on your account, I cannot wonder enough at the fact that these dissensions of Protestants are not about essentials, fundamentals, or heads of our religion, but about less important questions, even though it has been made amply manifest against the popes, and from Jewel's *Apology* it is clear that it has been approved among us."

Overall goes on to mention that the Archbishop's brother, the Bishop of Salisbury, has entered the fray with a book against the Arminians and against Thomson's *Diatribe*.[2] He is not surprised, he reports, since Perkins had defended the same position in his Reformed Catholic (1597). All Overall can offer is the pious wish that theological questions about the Christian faith could be taken from and defined by, not the zeal of parties and private opinions, but the certain word of God and the consensus of the ancient Church.

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 607-608, No. 562.

[2] This was Robert Abbot (1560-1617). The book is *De Gratia et Perseverantia Sanctorum, Exercitationes aliquot habitae in Academia Oxoniensi, Quibus accessit Animadversio in Richardi Thomsoni Anglo-Belgici Diatribam de amissione et intercisione Iustificationis, & Gratia*, Francofurti, 1618. It is highly unlikely that this book was published in Frankfurt. But it cannot be cited as evidence that High

Andrewes has not yet had time to read Grotius' little book through even once. But he has indicated to Overall that he thinks Grotius has assigned too much power in sacred and ecclesiastical matters to the civil power. This is becoming a dreary chorus.

Grotius' answer[1] thanks Overall for his letters which

Calvinist attacks on Arminians had been throttled in the press, for, as I shall show below, Overall had actually to send Thomson's book, which inspired this attack, to the Continent for publication. Abbot's book consists of a series of lectures against Bertius among others as well as Thomson, delivered in 1614 and 1615. His early attack is on Bertius, whose de Apostasia Sanctorum he discusses, although the book he admits has not yet reached him (p. 4). "Repertus est", he says, "iam pridem Petrus quidam Bertius Cacotheologus Leydensis qui librum edere haud veritus est titulo certe ipso execrabilem, de Apostasia Sanctorum, homo, ut videtur, ex Armini schola, quem & Vorstiana illa libertas prophetandi, hoc est, minimis cuique in religionem bene constitutam infaniendi licentia, transversum rapuit, eique, ut a recepta Ecclesiarum nostrarum sententia pruritu quodam novitatis, & vanissimo singularitatis studio discederet, persuasit." (p. 3) In a later lecture "De Veritate Gratiae Christi"(p. 26) he attacks the doctrine of Universal Grace, which Arminian doctrine, he says, is embodied in the "Ordines Hollandiae & Westfrisiae". Here he brings in Baro: "Petrus Barous, quem huius perfidiae nomine Cantabrigiensis aliquando Academia cum laude sua evomuit, paulo luculentius rem expressit, sum. 3, sentent. de praedest. Deum praeviso lapsu hominis, primum tamen hominem, & omnes posteros ad aeternae felicitatis participationem creare statuisse...." His attack on Thomson I shall discuss below.

[1] Dated April 16, 1618, Molhuysen, I, 613, No. 570.

in these days of upset, he says, in church and state, are his solace. He rejoices that "you in Episcopal liberty cannot be damned for sentiments which the ancient church would not sustain as damnable." He reports that the Counter-Remonstrants are now urging a National Synod because they hope thus to make their victory certain by their majority. The Remonstrants are urging provincial synods as the safer course. There may be a hint of the resort to force which proved to be the Remonstrants' undoing, in his comment that "if this does not succeed we must consult about greater remedies." He still is begging Overall to have Andrewes read his book. If he read it diligently he would find that Grotius had extricated himself from all the great difficulties of the question. He is still avidly awaiting Andrewes' opinion. He reports that German theologians have praised the book, even though Ravenspurger of Groningen, "a ferocious youth", has risen against it, pouring out his poison upon him, accusing him of heresy because, in defending the Atonement, "I did not assert that God could not in any other way condone [our] sins, also that I said Christ suffered the punishments of Hell, and other things of that kind." Vossius, he says, has answered Ravenspurger for him.

Grotius added at this time to his personal appeals to England, a barrage of books and other publications, and lists of recommended reading, hoping against hope, I suppose, that the intellectuals could turn the tide. It is apparent that this was part of a policy of the Remonstrants, for many of the books he recommends had first appeared years before and were now being re-issued. I have already noted his recommendation of Arminius' answer to Perkins; it is now re-issued in 1612. The *Collatio* of Arminius and Junius was also re-issued in 1613, as was the "defensio" of Corvinus against a book by Tilenus. A "responsio" by the same author was re-issued in 1614. On July 9, 1617, Grotius sends to Overall "a book which consists of two letters, one of the Walchereners who firmly follow Calvin, the other of the Remonstrants who follow Melanchthon more closely."[1] Overall acknowledges it in his letter of August 23d[2] with the comment: "I wonder and grieve that there are so many who cannot bear such a moderate sentiment, so pious and learned...."

We need not summarize all the exchanges of theological opinion which have characterized the letters between Grotius and Overall to come to the conclusion that in the visit of Grotius to England, and the subsequent correspondence, both sides were affected. On his return from England, in a letter to Uitenbogaert, Grotius informed him that there were really three schools of theologians in England,[3] one which favors the Remonstrants, one the Counter-Remonstrants, and one which adopted a position somewhere between the two. This last school was represented by Overall, and it is apparent from his comments that in the end he has been won over to the Remonstrants. This, however, was not so important as Grotius thought it was going to be, for when the issue came to political theory, theological agreement foundered on the rock of the distribution of power.

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 574, No. 519. This was *Epistola Ecclesiastarum quos in Belgio Remonstrantes vocant...opposita Epistolae Delegatorum Classis Walchrianae*, 1617, by Barlaeus. There was also published in Leyden in the same year *Epistola Ecclesiastarum Quos in Belgio Remonstrantes vocant, ad Exterarum Ecclesiarum Reformatos Doctores....*, which has been attributed to Episcopius.

[2] Molhuysen, I, 577, No. 526.

[3] Molhuysen, I, No. 348, June 8, 1614.

Grotius had come to England with a prepared statement of his views on predestination which he at once showed to Overall. On May 16, 1613, Overall wrote to him:[1]

> I am returning to you your Conciliatio Dissidentium de Re Praedestinaria et Gratia Opinionum[2] which pleases me very much. But I fear that the party which opposes you in this country, especially that rigid faction which is of Calvin's view, will not approve of it, if I am not mistaken. This sect of Zeno will not lightly give way to moderate feelings, particularly in these points, but they will hold on with their teeth to the fatal doctrine of predestination, both in the pure, upright nature, and in the corrupt nature of man, with their reprobates - that is all men except those absolutely elect - excluded from the redemption by Christ and sufficient grace, outside of the intention of God and Christ.

There follows a long outline of his doctrine of predestination. He insists on retaining the full power of God, who is able to decree whatever He will. He summarizes also the order of predestination, which is the central problem. He insists on the inclusion of man's free will in the process.

On his return from England Grotius wrote the letter to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 240, No. 267.
[2] This treatise, says Professor Hyma, remained unpublished until 1652, when it appeared in Grotii Quaedam hactenus inedita (pp. 236-264) Amsterdam. It was later reprinted in Hugonis Grotii Operum Theologicorum, III, 351-358. His emphasis is on the foreknowledge of God to bridge the chasm between the decrees and reprobation. He cites Overall's opinion in support of this foreknowledge doctrine.

Uitenbogaert which I mentioned above, outlining the differences he had found between the doctrines among the liberals in England, and the Remonstrants in Holland. It is Overall's doctrine that he puts forward there as the dominating one among those whom he looks to to support the Remonstrants. "These", he adds, "since I know them to be a great number, and I know that they agree with the Remonstrants in most things, I do not wish to offend. It is not necessary for us to go over wholly to this sentiment, but I think we should beware lest we separate those who think this way from us, for their patronage could be very useful to us. They will be separated from us, however, if they consider that their doctrine is influenced by us in a way inimical to the glory of God and the edification of the churches." He recommends a change of wording in the doctrinal statement of the Remonstrants, which will allow the English doctrine to be held.

Whether or not such a change was made I have not been able to discover, since Grotius does not make clear what document he was discussing with Uitenbogaert at the time. But he went away from England with the feeling that he had the support of the theologians, and that the Remonstrants and the school of Overall did not differ in any important way. He writes to Lingelsheim in June 1613:

> I found there [in England] also very many theologians who are not rigid, harsh, nor hard-headed, but lenient, just and easy, in whom knowledge is the leading factor, and their charity no less. 1

---

1 Molhuysen, I, 247, No. 271.

And again that September, he writes Lingelsheim, defining exactly how he thought English theology was a support for the Arminian cause. For they could separate fundamental questions of faith from the non-essential theological questions. He says:

> ...I rejoice that Paraeus continues to stand on the distinction between questions of faith and theological questions, which, however, among us are mostly thought to be of a later kind, of the higher reaches of religion and indicative of a man's learning. We have often received from England an opposing judgment of the bishop of Spalatro and others of England in which this [differentiation] is clearly contained. The Arminian party does not cry up this doctrine as necessary, but demands equal law and liberty either of speaking or of remaining silent as dissidents. [1]

It is hard to divine where Grotius heard of the "great numbers" of Arminians in England. They certainly did not make themselves felt in his behalf. There must have been a great many more than we have heard about, for Archbishop Abbot had spent his years at Oxford attacking the doctrines of general grace which Laud, Buckeridge, and Howson, were promulgating. But their names appear only fleetingly. The one who seemed to be most prominently identified with the new liberal doctrines was Richard Thomson, but he was dead before Grotius got to England. We can, however, glimpse some facts about him, although no outline of his doctrinal views is extant.

Overall's letter of May 16, 1613, notes that he is sending Grotius the manuscript of Thomson's Diatribae de

---

[1] Ibid., p. 580, No. 528.

Intercisione justitiae, not so much apparently for Grotius' information on the subject, but more as a means of getting it published, although there is no mention of publication by Overall. Holland had become the place for clandestine publication, and as we have seen, the Remonstrant battle was being fought out in England largely in terms of imports of books.[1] It may be, of course, that he conceived of it more in terms of bringing the support of England to the aid of the Remonstrants, and in that sense it would do more good if published in the Netherlands.

Grotius tells him in his reply that he has been inexpressibly pleased by Overall's outline of his doctrine, and this little book, which, he says, confirms him "in sobria veterum" (in the sober theology of the ancients). He has showed it, he says, to pious and learned men there in Holland who were also greatly pleased. And it is the book as well, as Overall's disquisition which prompts his remark: "... quibusque imprimis voluptas fuit intellegere non esse eam totius Anglicanae Ecclesiae sententiam quam confidenter admodum iactant illi, qui praeter Calvinum et Ursinum vix quicquam legerunt."

---

[1] From Winwood's Memorials, II, 195: "There are sundry factious and schismatical persons, who have planted themselves in the Low Countries where they have liberty without impeachment or contradiction to publish in print many books and anabaptistical pamphlets slandering the ecclesiastical government in England. And to this end Sir Noel Caron hath written, at the King's request, that certain books now in hand to be printed at Amsterdam be stayed, and all others likewise suppressed and restrained." (Quoted in the Jacobean Journal) It says something for the offensive undertaken by the High Calvinists that in 1613 it is a publication by a friend of Overall and Andrewes which must be sent out of the country to be printed.

We hear no more from the book until Grotius' letter of June 26, 1616, when he says:

> The little book by Thomson has now been put in type and will shortly appear. I hope the sight of its arguments will make some to be gone from that dogma which has decided that the same men at the same time could be the cup of the harlot and the cup of Christ, [this phrase is in Greek; it is apparently his way of characterizing the Calvinist dogma that a man could be in mortal sin and in a state of grace at the same time] and from that dogma which weakens all the power of the keys of the church. We are the more stirred about protecting the supreme power by law, because unless this be maintained we see the road opened up wide for schismatic secessions, especially in a church not constituted in the best possible way. [1]

The book did indeed appear in octavo in Leyden in 1616, and was re-issued in 1618, apparently from the corrected copy which Overall announces he has ready in a letter to Grotius in August 1616.[2] Grotius looked for some effect from it in England. He writes to Vossius at the end of August, 1616[3] to ask if Vossius thinks it is "satis vendibilis". He adds: "Imprimis exspecto quid in Anglia de hoc libro futurum sit. Nam Cantuarensis Primas si rescierit, turbas, ni fallor, debit."

He was not to be disappointed. Robert Abbot answered it in the book I have mentioned above. Abbot is rather gentle with Thomson, considering the usual tone of theological polemic of the day. He speaks of Thomson as "...vir multis literarum nominibus non immerito commendatus," only led astray some way into the profane doctrines of Bertius.[1] Abbot goes on to say that the book by Thomson which he is answering was kept from publication by those who had in their keeping "ne quid Ecclesia detrimenti caperet, ne quid recepto salubriter fidei dogmati contrarium exiret."[2] The book was transported, he says, across to the Low Countries, after the author's death, he knows not how, and obtained the credence in Leyden which it was denied in London. It was Thomson who had first given Bertius' book to Casaubon,[3] and the accusation of heresy was made against Thomson apparently largely because he too claimed that the elect could fall from grace. Abbot quotes Thomson's claim that:

---

[1] Molhuysen, I, 516-517, No. 460.
[2] Ibid., p. 523, No. 468.
[3] Ibid., p. 527, No. 473.

> Hominem semel vere iustificatum non necessario semper iustificatum manere, sed posse vel omnino, vel ad tempus ea gratia excidere, prout scilicet, lapsus in peccata gravia contra conscientiam, vel haereses, vel errores contra fundamentum fidei, aut in iisdem sine poenitentia immoritur, aut ex iis postea per poenitentiam salutarem resurgit, & resipiscit. [4]

By March 14, 1618, Grotius has heard about Abbot's book, although he has not yet seen it. He writes asking Vossius if he has seen it, and if so, what his opinion is.[5]

Thomson died in 1613, apparently before the arrival of Grotius, who does not speak of having met him, and he was a close friend of both Casaubon and Overall, who certainly would have at least mentioned him if he had been available.[1] His influence as a teacher was apparently considerable. Mullinger in his *Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century* says:

---

[1] Pages 140-141.
[2] Page 142.
[3] See above, p. 26, note 1. Harrison, p. 181.
[4] Page 144 of Abbot's book. I have not been able to find a copy of Thomson's.
[5] Molhuysen, I, 609, No. 564. Abbot was apparently a more able scholar and moderate theologian than his brother. Casaubon, on his visit to Oxford, had been much impressed by his conduct of a disputation there.

> 'Lately', says a writer, speaking of Chappell, who was fellow of Christ's during Milton's residence there, 'there sprung up a new brood of such as did assist Arminianism, as Dutch Tompson of Clare Hall, and Mr William Chappell, fellow of Christ's College; as the many pupils that were arminianized under his tuition show. [2]

Abbot's gentle dealing with Thomson was not shared by later writers. Hickman says of him:

> He was a man of a most debauched conversation, and confirmed himself in his debauchedness, by his Arminianism; for when men reproved him for his prophaness, he would say my will is free, I am a Child of the Devil to day, tomorrow I will make my self a Child of God.... [3]

For Hickman he was "the grand propagator of Arminianism." His nickname of "Dutch" would seem to argue that he was the first of what I have called the "rationalist" Arminians, but it may have been also merely from the fact that he had been born in Holland, of English parents. He probably came to England at an early age, for he was educated at Cambridge, receiving his B.A. there in 1597 at Clare Hall, where he was also elected fellow. He received his M.A. in 1596, at Oxford. It may be that the more liberal theological atmosphere of Oxford made this move a necessity for him. Lancelot Andrewes presented him to the rectory of Snailwell in Cambridgeshire at an undetermined date, and in 1611 he wrote a tract in defence of Andrewes' *Torturae Torti*. According to Pattison, he was one of the earliest acquaintances of Casaubon. He had apparently gone to the Continent as tutor to a nobleman,[1] and had met Casaubon in Geneva:

---

[1] Plaifere in his *Appeale to Gospel*, of 1651, speaks of Thomson as Overall's "diligent auditor and familiar". (p. 23).

[2] London and Cambridge, 1867, p. 49. Of Chappell I have found no mention in the documents I have used. The McAlpin Catalogue, 1st Supplement (not yet published; on cards in the catalogue of the collection at Union Theological Seminary) lists him as Bishop of Cork, and as author of *A Brief Commentary upon the Ciij Psalms*, 1649. The 2nd Supplement lists his *The Preacher, or the art and method of preaching*, 1656. Mullinger cites *British Biography*, IV, 448, as the source of this quotation.

[3] Henry Hickman, *Historia Quinq-Articularis Exarticulata*,

> It was he who had introduced Henry Wotton to Casaubon, and, more than this, who first mentioned Casaubon to Scaliger. Thomson may thus be said to have been the discoverer of Casaubon, as it was through Scaliger that Casaubon became known to the Parisian friends. Thomson was a book and manuscript hunter, and had helped Casaubon to some things of this kind, which he would fain have had regarded as presents, but on this point Casaubon was scrupulous. Nor was it only gratitude which bound Casaubon to Thomson. Thomson's amiable qualities attracted Casaubon; he was a favourite with Madame Casaubon, and he is the only correspondent to whom the children send their remembrances. In his university (he was M.A. of Clare) [*DNB* contradicts Pattison on this point] he was well-considered as a scholar, and was on the company of translators of King James' Bible for Hebrew. [He was on the committee for Genesis to 2 Kings, with Overall, Andrewes, and Saravia.] But he had also coquetted with many classics, Greek and Latin, helping any of his friends in their editions. He had given suggestions to Casaubon

---

or Animadversions on Dr Heylin's Quinquarticular History, 1673, p. 502. This is a repetition of the same charge made on p. 396. Prynne had made the same charge of drunkenness against Thomson earlier. He says (*Anti-Arminianisme*, 1630, p. 268) that he "was but an Anglo-Belgicus, a dissolute, ebrious, prophane, luxurious English-Dutchman...."

[1] Thomas Farnaby says, according to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that Thomson lived for some time under the protection of Sir Robert Killigrew.

> for Suetonius, for Polybius, for the Augustan historians, and to Farnaby for Martial. He had talked of editing himself the Epistles to Atticus, and Zonaras' Lexicon, but never did anything. He was drawn, like his friend, into the theological vortex, and his literary schemes ended in a polemical tract. 1

Casaubon made his first overtures to Scaliger through a message sent by Thomson, who was returning to England via Leyden. It may well have been at Leyden that Thomson received the theological bent which turned him away from Calvinism. He is the first, and as far as I have been able to discover, the only link in these early days between Dutch and English Arminianism. We may assume that he was one of those who worked to have Casaubon invited to England. Pattison continues:

> After his arrival in England, Casaubon occasionally saw Thomson, and always with pleasure. Richard Thomson and the Bishop of Ely are two men in whose society time is not lost. When he visited Cambridge it is Thomson to whom Casaubon belongs, who, as a matter of right, shows him over the university. And when, afterwards in 1611, Thomson got into trouble, it is to Casaubon he turns to befriend him with the bishops. 2

While Casaubon was staying with Andrewes at Downham in 1611, he received an appeal from Thomson who had been, he said, the victim of a cabal at Clare Hall to turn him out of a university office he held. He was accused of drunkenness, and had been put in a very bad light with the archbishop. The charge was that he was incapable of presiding over the disputations in the schools. He tells Casaubon

---

1 Casaubon, p. 333.
2 Ibid., p. 334.

that the master of Clare was getting a memorial against him signed in the university. "What is most grievous to me [he writes to Casaubon] is that they have gone the length of waiting on the Bishop of Ely to calumniate to him my walk and character, nay, a thing which is ludicrous, to represent that I am unfit for my office. As if I were such a fool and so inexperienced as not to be qualified to preside over the disputations in the schools."[1] As Pattison points out, the most important part of the charge was more likely that he had also been "suspected of a much more criminal weakness for Arminianism." George Abbot had just been made archbishop, and the High Calvinists thought, no doubt, that this was their opportunity to root the heretics out of their university. Casaubon prevailed upon Andrewes to invite Thomson to Downham, where the three of them passed the evening in talk. Perhaps the solution that was worked out by Andrewes, who may well have been the one who suggested that Baro leave the field to his enemies also, was Thomson's removal to the rectory of Snailwell. He died on January 8, 1612/13, and was buried in St. Edward's Cambridge, so it may be that he was able to hold out at Cambridge anyway.

The arrest of Grotius and the other leaders of the Remonstrants and the execution of Oldenbarnevelt marked the end in 1618 of Arminian resistance on a political level in the Netherlands. The Synod of Dort followed soon after.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 394.

Its effect in England, and the beginnings of the growth of mature Arminianism, which is a mixture of the early Anglican theology which I have traced in Baro, Hooker, Overall and Andrewes, with the rationalistic theology which came from the Continent, is material for another study, perhaps even longer than this. These studies, although in a sense preliminary, are also, as I have found a necessary preface to any real understanding of what English Arminianism was and became.

Grotius found in the end that English Arminianism was not enough like Dutch Arminianism to make any alliance possible between them, and all his efforts at explanation and reconciliation were vain. But his visit to England and the subsequent events in Holland served, I believe, to awaken the English party of liberal theological views to the necessity for taking the offensive against High Calvinist pretensions in the English Church and state. To this extent it was a highly significant event. It opened a new phase in the development of English Arminianism which was to lead it to a main role in the most important events of the seventeenth century.

CHAPTER SEVEN

LITERATURE AND THEOLOGY

It remains to suggest how the facts which I have reviewed in the preceding chapters can be made to apply to the literature of the time. Is it possible to establish some relation between the change which I have begun to chart and the nature of the contemporary literary, especially the poetic, impulse? "We have," says Mr. T. S. Eliot, "tacitly assumed, for some centuries past, that there is no relation between literature and theology."[1] He is here, of course, attempting to revise the course of intellectual history to bring theology to bear on contemporary criticism of literature.[2] It may be well to point out that theological terms will produce only irrelevant criticism when applied to literature written out of a scheme of the universe which uses other than theological terms. The criticism implied is valid, however, in reference to the literature of the past, Since the categories of theology do not express, or until recently have not expressed, the needs which we have gone to the literature of the past to satisfy, and since theology refuses to be a constant in the way we have used to go about accounting for literature, we have too largely ignored it in criticism.[3] For one artist the theology of his time may supply a usable philosophy, an acceptable set of concepts for a pattern of the universe; for another it may be an unacceptable imposition which nevertheless has a part in stimulating him to provide a substitute in his art. Because it may operate negatively or positively the reality and function of theology has been too often neglected or misconstrued.

---

[1] "Religion and Literature", Essays Ancient and Modern, New York, 1936, p. 92.

[2] He has, of course, been more successful in setting that process in motion by his poetry than by his criticism.

[3] The tide is of course turning strongly. Professor Battenhouse has restored the true theological basis of the work

ist
disputed
ion.

Literature as a cultural manifestation, completely analyzable in terms of economic and social forces, will not satisfy those who see a function for literature as art in a world less and less answerable to the categories of science. We may assume, as Professor Harry Levin does,[1] that literature is an institution like any other institution, but we are coming to detect that "...social institutions assume a character which may almost be called sacramental, for they are the outward and imperfect expression of a supreme spiritual reality."[2] Literature, and all art, can, and from a consideration of their function from other angles, must be

---

of Marlowe and Chapman, (Marlowe's Tamburlaine, Nashville, Tenn., 1941.) and has more recently given acute consideration to the theological assumptions in Shakespeare's Measure for Measure. ("Measure for Measure and Christian Doctrine of the Atonement", PMLA, LXI (1946), pp. 1029-1059.) Mr. Eliot's criticism, strangely enough, has remained on such a technical level of style for the sake of style, that he seems to be farther than most critics from answering his own demands set forth in the essay from which I have quoted.

[1] "Literature as an Institution", Criticism: The Foundations of Modern Literary Judgment, Mark Schorer, Josephine Miles, and Gordon McKenzie, edd., New York, 1948, pp. 546-553.

[2] Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, p. 26. He is speaking here of medieval society, but what was consciously true of the Middle Ages remains true when the terms of 'the supreme spiritual reality' have changed. Institutions remain the expression of what the society takes for its supreme spiritual reality.

thought of as potentially a kind of sacramental control of a universe in the act of creating it.[1] Lionel Trilling has defined literature in words which will serve also to define religion: "Literature is one of the cultural agents that form the attitudes, even the categories, by which at least some part of life is apprehended."[2] Christopher Dawson also links them. He says:

> Religion is the key to history. We cannot understand the inner form of a society unless we understand its religion. We cannot understand its cultural achievements unless we understand the religious beliefs that lie behind them. In all ages the first creative works of a culture are due to a religious inspiration and dedicated to a religious end....Religion stands at the threshold of all the great literatures of the world. Philosophy is its offspring and is a child which constantly returns to its parent. [3]

Thus an investigation of religious doctrine is one way of investigating the true nature and accomplishment of the literature of an era, and of accounting for elements in it which escape the usual controls of historical investigation. Certain theological systematizations of the universe, and of the position and possibilities of human beings in it, issue more naturally and readily into literature than others, but they must be considered more deeply than as merely providing the subject-matter of literary productions, as in this statement by George Santayana:

---

[1] "The poet's passionate desire to perceive order for himself (not to accept it as a stereotype 'given', handed down) makes his final creation a kind of world or cosmos; a concretely languaged, synoptically felt world; an ikon or image of the 'real world'." (Austin Warren, Rage for Order, Chicago, 1948, p. v.)

[2] Partisan Review, June, 1949, p. 656.

[3] Religion and Culture, London, 1948, p. 50.

> ...the human race hitherto, whenever it has reached a phase of comparatively high development and freedom, has found a conception of its place in nature, no less than of the contents of its life; and...this conception has been the occasion of religious sentiments and practices; and further...every art whether literary or plastic, has drawn its favorite themes from this religious sphere. [1]

Religion as the raw material of literature has been extensively investigated for the seventeenth century.[2] Part of my point here is that religion as the subject-matter of poetry enters upon a new phase at a certain point in the seventeenth century, and that this phenomenon has a very real relation to the theological change upon which I have been focussing. The Jacobean poets of serious purpose deal with religious subjects more in theological terms than their predecessors; their theology is closer to the purposes of art. The Elizabethan period produces fewer real religious poets of real achievement, and those, like Spenser, whom it does produce must turn to other more humanistic terms to work out their art. What I am suggesting is that they could find no adequate values for human life in the theology they were offered, and thus they had to create a universe from the beginning in which men could live with meaning.

To summarize it another way, my focus here is on the rise of a theology which could be at home with art. It was a theology which (to paraphrase Mr. Eliot) allowed the condition where 'aesthetic sensibility could be extended into spiritual perception, and spiritual perception could be extended into aesthetic sensibility and disciplined taste' within the terms and symbols of Christian theology.[1]

---

[1] "Religion in Shakespeare", Poetry and Religion, New York, 1911, p. 162.

[2] As by Miss Helen C. White in her English Devotional Literature, 1600-1640, University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 24, Madison, Wisconsin, 1931, and The Metaphysical Poets. A Study in Religious Experience.

To make this point I am forced, however reluctantly, to take sides in the contemporary argument between 'liberals' and 'traditionalists' in criticism. For the purposes of making a beginning toward a fuller explanation of the phenomenon I have just cited, the limitations on the concept of literature which the 'liberal' position accepts are crippling. The concept of literature must be widened sufficiently to allow of studying it in its actual relationship with a religious consciousness that can be looked on as vital and meaningful. The 'liberal' thesis is that literature, as well as other cultural manifestations, can, if not now, then eventually, be wholly contained in the terms of science.[2] It is from the beginning limited by its commit-ment to the assumptions of scientific semantics that the only 'real' language is practical and rational communication. This is, however, to ignoreone whole side of the origin and development of language: language as magic.[1] It is noteworthy, and perhaps not accidental, that the two theories of the nature and function of literature which are clashing to-day, literature conceived as merely the extension of the practical expression of a society's practical adaptation to an environment (also conceived of as material), and literature of the nature of transcendent art, correspond to these two uses of language which exist in the very beginnings of its use, as it has been reconstructed in studies of primitive societies. Semantics has from the beginning ignored the reality of this second use of language; the assumption behind the 'liberal' definition of literature is that it must be completely explained in terms of the uses of language as a social tool for the practical purposes of existence.[2] Art, I do not doubt, can be arrived at through

---

[1] Notes Toward the Definition of Culture, New York, 1949, p. 29.

[2] The attitude from which the following statement defines the traditionalist view is itself a good definition of the 'liberal' position: "It [the traditionalist theory] asserts that living language, literary sensibility and poetic values are supported by the traditional, the Catholic, the regional, the mythic, the aristocratic, and by a sense of the tragic, of transcendental attributes of sin and grace. Language and sensibility and values are destroyed by rationalism, liberalism, positivism, progressivism, equalitarianism, Shelleyanism, sociology, and the ideology of the Enlightenment." (Robert Gorham Davis, Partisan Review, May, 1949, p. 514.) I must refuse such a drawing of the issues for a definition of the critical basis of this study. It is necessary to admit nevertheless that after the scientific analysis of

---

a culture or of a work of art or literature has been completed and gone its full course, there remains an element that escapes the 'liberal' analysis, something unconditional which necessitates what I call a transcendental, or sacramental, concept of literature.

[1] The best discussion of this element of the origins of language and a brilliant development of its philosophic and artistic implications are found in Suzanne Langer's Philosophy in a New Key.

[2] Mr. I. A. Richards, for instance, seems to have sacrificed whatever interest he had in literature as art to the scientific fallacy that the communication process can be sufficiently explained in neural terms to account for the elements of language as they make art. The assumption then could be drawn that it will ultimately be possible to construct a machine to produce literature. This naivete seems to get more widespread as the intellectual

the extension of the practical use of language, but the fact the 'liberal' theory chooses to ignore is that it differs when it is art from that practical use not only in degree, not only in technique, but also in kind. It is, in fact, for me a proof of the higher position of what I have called the sacramental concept of art that the rational, practical craftsman of communication has so often, at least in the past, been able to arrive at a total of the elements of his communication greater than the sum of its parts. Professor Whitehead defined the kinds of language as three:

> Language delivers its evidence in three chapters, one on the meanings of words, another on the meanings enshrined in grammatical forms, and the third on meanings beyond individual words and beyond grammatical forms, meanings miraculously revealed in great literature. 1

---

disciplines get more and more provincial and specialized, and as the real effect of the humanities in education dwindles. A prime example is the 'science' of Cybernetics. It is one thing, however, to have a mind of the limited vision of a Stuart Chase decide what language is, and ignore completely what else it also is; it is another and much more disturbing thing to have the humanistic vigor in a society become so weak that a constant succession of this sort of de-humanizing theories meet with no more real criticism than these! There is a dogmatism of science which now stands in the way of the Humanities' accomplishment of their function, and it is being exploited just at the time when the scientists have given over any hope of being able to deal with the present predicament of man in any area where their writ runs. Professor Whitehead commented on it some years ago in his Adventures of Ideas thus: (New York, 1933, p. 185.) "The history of European thought, even to the present day, has been tainted by a fatal misunderstanding. It may be termed The Dogmatic Fallacy. The error consists in the persuasion that we are capable of producing notions which are adequately defined in respect to the complexity of relationship required for their illustration in the real world. Canst thou by searching describe the Universe?...During the medieval epoch in Europe, the theologians were the chief sinners in respect to dogmatic finality. During the last three centuries, their bad preeminence in this habit passed to the men of science."

1 Adventures of Ideas, p. 291.

In this culminating usage it is that language is close to religion in its cultural function. According to Professor Paul Tillich, "...religion has to do with man's ultimate concern, his concern with the meaning of life and with all the forces that threaten or support that meaning, in personal and social life, in the arts and sciences, in politics, in industry, education, and the church."[1] "The fright of the mind before the unknown," said T. E. Hulme, "created not only the first gods, but also the first art."[2]

There is, of course, a sense in which there is tension between religion and literature. The assumptions of literature are incurably humanistic.[3] In their ultimate forms, according to Hulme, "It is necessary to realize that there is an absolute, and not a relative, difference between humanism (which we can take to be the highest expression of the vital), and the religious spirit."[4] There are times in the history of literature when they swing far enough apart so that literature must look elsewhere for its "objective correlatives", and religion will look upon literature and art as corrupting. Both of these things happened in the English Renaissance. At other times, however, they swing back into coincidence again. Whether the theology modifies the literature, or the literature the theology, is the ultimate question for which this study can only hope to begin the ordering of the terms. Arthur Machen thought that "...art and religion stand or fall together, religion being the foundation of the fine arts."[1] Messrs. Wellek and Warren feel that "It seems as hard to isolate the strictly literary factor as the religious factor and to answer the question whether the influence is due to the particular factor itself, or to other forces for which the factor is a mere 'shrine' or 'channel'."[2] It is enough to say, perhaps, that their relationship changes constantly in any given period, and it must be said that neither of them develops alone. The extension or restriction of the assumptions of religion may be the cause or the sign of the rise or fall of tension between it and literature. They may also be in one way a sign, and in another a cause, of the assumptions on which both art and science operate in the same period.

---

[1] James Luther Adams, "Tillich's Concept of the Protestant Era", The Protestant Era, Chicago, 1948, p. 273. "The thing that gives to art its quality of greatness, he [Tillich] says, is its pulsating witness to something sublime and holy that shimmers through or overflows the form and the content....Tillich speaks of this essential power and meaning of reality as the import of a work of art in contrast to its form or content. This import is intuited, for example in a painting in which the artist seems to waver between the portrayal of an object and the expression of a meaning that transcends it. In short, the artist reveals a power and meaning that transcend himself as well as the form and the content of the painting, that transcend both subject and object." (Ibid., p. 298.)

[2] Speculations, p. 74.

[3] "A tragic writer does not have to believe in God, but he must believe in man." Joseph Wood Krutch, "The Tragic Fallacy", Criticism, ed. Schorer, Miles, McKenzie, p. 79.

[4] Speculations, p. 8.

Religion, the arts, and philosophy are all attempts, conscious or unconscious, to find some interpretation of life, to introduce some pattern of meaning into existence. Any full insight into the true nature of literature in this period must include theology. In the next century, or even in the last half of the seventeenth century, it is true, philosophy becomes the most valuable indication of the bases of literature. It does not account for much of the full complexity and greatness of that of the early seventeenth century. I must then clarify, perhaps, the sense in which this is true. Professor Herschel Baker puts it well thus:

---

[1] Hieroglyphics, London, 1923, p. 133.

[2] Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature, New York, 1949, p. 104.

> Even at this late date, an adequate definition of religion is unattainable. It remains the supreme symbol of what is perhaps its most fundamental quality, which is mystery. As such it is to be distinguished from philosophy. Both are modes of reacting to experience, and both rise from the same set of problems. But religion acknowledges the supremacy of forces beyond either man's comprehension or control and it derives its character from organized belief in that supremacy. Religion formulates man's incapacity for rational explanation: it celebrates and ritualizes his impotence; it sublimates mystery into theology. Philosophy, however, does none of these things - or when it does, as in Neo-platonism, it has become religion. It confronts the data of experience, examines them with ostensible objectivity, and attempts to explain and systematize them.
>
> Whatever religion is, it is not the philosophic attempt to understand the universe. 1

---

1 The Dignity of Man, Cambridge, Mass., 1947, p. 110. Exception must be taken, I believe, to the excessively 'philosophic' tone of this definition itself. Religion does acknowledge 'the supremacy of forces beyond man's control' but only if one defines that 'control' in an excessively limited and scientific way. Religion is itself a means of control, in the way that art is, although certainly not in the way that Boulder Dam is. (For the full statement of this truth see, again, Suzanne Langer's Philosophy in a New Key.) It is more than 'organized belief in that supremacy', it is an organized attempt to control the universe by putting one's own personality in

T. E. Hulme, although he reveals to the critic of literature a rather pitifully naive assumption of the superiority of the philosophical, has made the point that is important: the intellectual systematization involved in philosophy makes its object only a Weltanschauung, and removes it at once from the full expression of the complexity which art and religion take as their object. It puts it even farther away than does theology. Hulme says in fact that a Weltanschauung "is by no means necessarily connected with a philosophy." He goes on:

> The effort to find some 'interpretation of life', to solve what it feels to be the riddle of existence, is obviously a permanent characteristic of the human mind. It may find expression not only in philosophy, however, but in literature; where in a relatively formless way attempts may be made to deal with the relation of man to the world, and with all these questions, the answers to which used to be designated as Wisdom..../Those under the influence of a Weltanschauung/ want to fix it, to make it seem not so much a particular attitude as a necessary fact. They then endeavor, by expressing it in the elaborately worked out categories of a metaphysic, to give it a universal validity. Philosophy in this way provides a conceptual clothing for the interpretation of life current in any particular period. But the interpretation of life should always be distinguished from the refined organizations of concepts by which it has been expressed. 1

---

tune with the forces which, while beyond comprehension by systems of philosophy, nevertheless are seen as real. Belief is perhaps a prerequisite of religion where it is not of art, but all art implies belief, though it may not be conscious and not organize itself at all in the same way.

1 Speculations, p. 24. Although he is manfully criticising the excessive intellectualization of philosophy in the study of culture, the striking thing about this statement, for the student of literature, is the extent to which he is, more than he knows, the victim of those very tendencies

We must look beyond the terms of philosophy, beyond the assumed intellectual pattern of thought in the mind of the artist of any era, to that body of assumptions and feelings from which literature comes. My contention is that for the early seventeenth century theology offers a far more trustworthy area than philosophy.[1] Philip Toynbee in an article on the work of Henry Green has made the equivalent of this statement for the modern artist. He insists that one must distinguish between the term "vision" and Weltanschauung. The latter, he says, "...will not do instead, implying as it does a consciously held and readily

---

which he feels he is here analyzing. The assumption, for instance, that the attempt to find the riddle of existence is, first of all, only the conscious impulse of the human mind, and, secondly, that it finds its expression primarily in philosophy, is the arrogance of a converted Romantic rationalist. It must be emphasized that the subconscious, or unconscious, or instinctive, attempt to solve the riddle of the universe is the basis for all religion and all art, and that these admit at least the possibility that the riddle of the universe can be solved by a dance, or a poem, or by the true performance of a rite, and that the intellectual solution and explanation is not only basically artificial, but actually beside the point, and beside the point in much the same way as the scientific explanation of the universe.

[1] A reviewer of F. S. C. Northrop's The Meeting of East and West, in the Times Literary Supplement (August 5th, 1949, p. 498) isolates the inability to distinguish between theology and philosophy as one of the major reasons for Professor Northrop's ill-success in achieving the purpose of his book. He says: "He [Northrop] cannot allow religion (of the Western type) to exercise any independent influence on the development of culture....It becomes impossible [when Christianity as an historical revelation is identified with metaphysics] to distinguish religious 'faith' from assent to a metaphysical theory. Whatever theological dogmas are, it is surely evident that they are not, as Professor Northrop suggests, hypotheses." It is significant that Professor Northrop's definition of the "aesthetic" component of western civilization is faulty in just this same respect.

expressible body of belief." He "hesitantly" defines vision "as a writer's sensual, emotional and instinctive apprehension of the world, as opposed to the intellectual superstructure which he constructs on top of it."[1] He insists that this is the important area for criticism to concentrate upon. The "vision" which produces the literature of the early seventeenth century is intellectualized and systematized in theology more immediately than in philosophy. The significance of this fact is increased by the consideration that theology _takes the place of_ philosophy for a period of time, before it is again superseded by philosophy.

The "vision" of an artist may be in terms of a completely opposite set of values from those which underlie his _Weltanschauung_, or his philosophy. The most striking case of this is Dostoevsky. In the case of the poet it will often be not consciously or intellectually, but existentially, conceived. As Austin Warren puts it:

> Poetry is a double, a triple, discipline. There is a technical, most specifically a linguistic, training, partly traditional but chiefly self-acquired, a deformation and reorganization of the language. There is also a spiritual discipline - of confronting disorder in one's self and in the world; of facing existentially as a total human being living in time, the responsibility of vision and choice. 2

All this is perhaps an over-elaborate preface to the perspective in which I wish to place the historical explorations which make up the body of this study. It is not

---

1 "The Novels of Henry Green", _Partisan Review_, May, 1949, pp. 487-497, p. 494.
2 _Rage for Order_, p. v.

only that we cannot leave out of consideration the fact that the largest element in the intellectual background of the seventeenth century in England, in sheer bulk and in the extent to which it provides the elements and categories of the thinking and creation of the men of the time, is religion, guided and systematized by theology. We must also realize that within this important setting there takes place a sea-change in the whole mode of this theology. A new theology, with new philosophic implications, comes to power in the Church of England. The speed and extent of the change in theology, to my mind, were what alarmed the Puritan leaders and made them accept the necessity for armed rebellion in a way that political issues alone did not seem to have the power to do. The political and social implications of this change have been recognized, but there is more to be said about its relation with the literature of the time. The rise of science and rationalism has been made to loom larger for us, but to the men of that day this theological shift was a more important phenomenon. Part of the manifestation of that shift was a shift in the emphasis and the forms of worship, and it accepted a political theory which turned out to be suicidal. But when the smoke of war had cleared, this same theology and form of worship and polity could become the center also of the popular reaction against James II. As Professor Usher puts it in The Reconstruction of the English Church: "The Restoration restored neither the old monarchy nor the old Parliament, neither the old courts nor the old law, but the Church as Bancroft left it."[1]

In philosophic terms, the importance of this shift is the fact that a theological system that admits of free-will was installed officially in place of one which had traditionally denied it. With all the reservations that it is necessary to make about the distinction between theological fatalism and philosophic determinism,[2] we must admit that concurrent with this theological change came a philosophic revaluation and reconsideration of the basic values of human life in terms of the great questions of Determinism and Free-Will.[3] There is only space here to suggest that there is certainly some significance in the fact that Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton are products of periods in which there were flare-ups of debate and division, theological and philosophical, on free-will. The traces of it are quite overt in Chaucer,[4] especially in Troilus and Criseyde, and, of course, in Milton. They are less on the surface in the work of Shakespeare, probably because his medium was more popular and public, but he could not avoid them. It is a thesis that should not be hard to defend, that a belief in free-will is the first necessity of any artist,[1] no matter what side he takes in the argument on a theological basis during his lifetime, but one does not have to defend it to insist that the proportions of these men's art and the questions with which the themes of their work deal reflect a time in which these questions were in dispute in the official formulations of the theology and philosophy of the day. The conscious allegiance of that theology and philosophy on the most primary level certainly gave these men a more immediate and constant opportunity to examine their situations and characters directly in terms of such basic questions, without being led astray by such preliminary superficialities as the narrower obsession with society, for instance, forced upon the writers of the Restoration and eighteenth century, or which the obsession with physical science forced upon those of the nineteenth and twentieth.

---

[1] II, 266.

[2] See J. B. Mozley, A Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, pp. 1-3.

[3] I have already noted in Chapter I the valid distinction made by Preserved Smith between the doctrine of predestination and the effects of modern determinism. But the fact that this doctrine did not have a deterministic effect on the political and social actions of its exponents in the beginning does not detract from the very apparent affect of its dominance and the reaction against it on the forces that produced the literature of the century, some traces of which I am summarily to notice in what follows. The philosophy that produces dynamic mass action seldom has the effect of producing great art. The individual artist will usually be more intellectual, more responsive to the philosophic implications of a theology, although not in the sense of creating his work on the forms of a fully worked-out system.

[4] See Carleton F. Brown, "The Author of The Pearl Considered in the Light of His Theological Opinions", PMLA, IX, (1904), pp. 115-145.

All I have said above about the relationship of the theological, philosophic, and artistic elements of the seventeenth century can be best summed up, and considerably clarified, by another statement of Professor Whitehead's:

---

[1] The limitations of Kafka as an artist have recently been ascribed to his inability to believe in free-will at the same time as he believes in predestination. I think it may be said that the stronger the tension between the two, the more likely it is to produce art.

> Civilization is constituted out of four elements, (1) Patterns of Behavior, (2) Patterns of Emotion, (3) Patterns of Belief, and (4) Technologies.... all four constitutive elements interact upon each other. Also patterns of behavior are in the long run sustained or modified by patterns of emotion and patterns of belief. It is the primary business of religion to concentrate upon emotion and belief. [1]

I have emphasized my belief that in the seventeenth century the patterns of emotion in art and literature are more affected by the patterns of belief of which we see the codification and systematic expression in theology, and the pattern of emotion that the theology assumes in the ritual of worship, than vice versa. By contrast, as between religion and literature to-day, it seems that the patterns of belief owe more to literature. The measure of our predicament, of course, is contained in how overwhelmingly our patterns of belief are made by technologies, which contain no values.

Behind the pattern of emotion that the sum of the works of literature of a time, especially the poetry and drama, construct is the pattern of belief, which is the stylization and formulation of some view of the universe that an artist either can accept and use, or which he instinctively must reject. If he accepts that official pattern of belief completely enough he can lean on it for stylization of much of the symbol that another poet who cannot or will not accept it must construct for himself from the beginning. In this sense the former becomes what we call a religious poet.

---

[1] Adventures of Ideas, p. 216.

Mr. Eliot defines him thus in the essay I have cited above:

> ...the religious poet is not a poet who is creating the whole subject-matter of poetry in a religious spirit, but a poet who is dealing with a confined part of this subject-matter: who is leaving out what men consider their major passions, and thereby confessing his ignorance of them.

If he accepts the pattern of belief somewhat less as given he may be a better poet, but not necessarily a universal one. He may even accept it completely on a conscious level, but reveal subconscious repudiations of it. If, however, as an artist (and this qualification is necessary, since as a citizen or a social personality many great artists may seem to be completely at home in a scheme of values which the whole basis of their writings repudiates) he cannot accept or use the pattern of belief offered him by the theology of his time, and if he then has the resources to create his own universe totally, he can be a universal artist. There is no rule of thumb, but it is, I think, in this sense that theology must be considered in any estimation of the work of a poet. Someone has said that a minor poet may be a very good poet indeed; what he lacks is often only range. I am suggesting that the theology of his time may, by its ability to satisfy the artist, account for the restriction of range in his work. It is a fact that religious poetry seems to be either very good or very bad; seldom in between. It can be very bad when it offers a crutch of a completely accepted frame of reference to a bad poet, to whom it does not occur to challenge it. It seems that it is very good when the poet feels under the necessity of challenging it,

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

and then comes back to it.

Santayana seems to be approaching some such statement of the idea I began with when he says:

> In Shakespeare's time and country, to be religious already began to mean to be Puritanical; and in the divorce between the fulness of life on the one hand and the depth and unity of faith on the other, there could be no doubt to which side a man of imaginative instincts would attach himself. A world of passion and beauty without a meaning must seem to him more interesting and worthy than a world of empty principle and dogma, meagre, fanatical and false. It was beyond the power of synthesis possessed by that age and nation to find a principle of all passion and a religion of all life. 1

It is not, of course, true that to be religious in Shakespeare's day meant to be Puritanical, nor can we take seriously the suggestion that Shakespeare's is a world without meaning. But I think there is some significance in the fact that Shakespeare does not use the conventional terms of theology at all, although he does use theological ideas.

The pervading pattern of belief in the Elizabethan Church, as I have demonstrated, was Calvinistic predestination. A subconscious tension between predestination and the classical mode of humanism may account for many of the qualities of Elizabethan literature - the Elizabethans may, for instance, have turned to the classics so enthusiastically because the theology of Calvinism offered too limited a pattern of comprehension for the universe. I shall not argue this point; my purpose here is simply to call atten-

---

1 "Religion in Shakespeare", p. 161.

tion to the fact that the arrival of a new style in religious poetry, in the metaphysical poets, is in interesting coincidence with the change in prevailing theology. These men can be religious poets within the frame of their theology and at the same time be great poets. Professor Battenhouse has pointed out that

> The general tendency of Elizabethans to elevate poetry, symbol, fable, allegory, and ideal truth was accompanied by a loosening of adherence to historic Christianity, the visible Church, and the sacramental system. 1

These Jacobean poets and writers reconstitute the sacramental system as the material and basis of their art.

When Puritan and Anglican begin to divide on doctrine as well as polity is the beginning of the time when a more consistent generation begins to arise. It is the time when we can also begin to distinguish between a Puritan and an Anglican aesthetic. The excessive demands of Calvinistic dogmatists and anti-humanists, it seems to me, had the largest part in making this realignment, in making the era in which "humanistic Puritan" is a contradiction in terms. Humanism could live with Calvinistic predestination in the Elizabethan era, but when the doctrine became absolute predestination, and was pushed to the extremes at which we see it in Whitaker and Some, Ames and Abbot, they had to part ways. And, as I have emphasized, it was this humanism which played the largest part in making the downfall of predestination inevitable. The new coincidence of literature and

---

1 Marlowe's Tamburlaine, p. 36.

theology was in a sense unfortunate for both. For some poets, like Herrick, continue on into what is essentially heathendom in their flight from theology into the classics, and it may well be that Herbert might have become a more wide and universal poet than he did, without the refuge and reconciliation he found in the terms of his theology.

The outstanding cultural phenomenon of the early seventeenth century, part of the manifestation of which this thesis has directed itself toward charting, is the growth of Anglicanism, in the sense that the English Church comes to alter its doctrine to suit the demands of its conception of itself as an institution. As this new pattern of belief grows up we have a new set of poets and, more important, a new kind of poetry. Miss White says:

> It is not surprising...that, with one great exception, the religious poets of eminence, particularly the mystical and devotional poets come out of the more conservative and central tradition of the English Church. 1

Why should it not be surprising? I think it is because after the rise of High Calvinism the only place a poet could live, artistically speaking, was in the Anglican theology. Milton himself became Arminian in theology. after 1644.

To sum up perhaps more specifically what I have been driving toward, as I see it, Elizabethan literature can be

---

1 Helen White, The Metaphysical Poets, p. 52. The exception, Milton, Miss White notes, is epic and speculative more than lyrical and contemplative. She perhaps ignores too much the extent to which Milton's early aesthetic was Anglican, and the fact that Paradise Lost was written after the collapse of the doctrine of absolute predestination in England.

explained as a peculiar historical conjunction of a medieval cosmography (which includes a medieval conception of man's place in the universe) with a basic conflict or confusion in their concept of the nature of man. Any art, and especially drama, is futile without a sense of the meaningfulness of the struggle of man on earth. We may say that what makes the special tone of the whole Elizabethan drama, its inclusiveness, its universality, is the humanistic response to the theological challenge which became pervasive with the rise of High Calvinism, the tension between the explicit formulation of the doctrine of absolute predestination and the necessity felt by any art to find an explanation of the nature of man acceptable to the artist. There seems to me to be this much reason for the absence of any surface treatment of questions of theology or of formal religious patterns from most of Elizabethan literature, with all the qualifications that may be necessary.[1] With the growth of a sacramental concept of the church and the doctrinal Arminianism, English-style, which justified it, we find that most of the real literature, both poetry and prose, is by Anglicans, and that they build their writing increasingly closely on theological patterns of belief. Milton's is a greater name and genius again because he could find nothing that he could use in the doctrines of High Calvinism, although he also could not stomach the political implications of the church which held his aesthetic allegiance for a period. Falling thus between two stools, he must, like Shakespeare, produce his own universe. But we may note that with his fostering in an Anglican theology, its Calvinism later and more liberal than that of Shakespeare's time, even in his revolt he is constrained to see his themes in more theological terms than any other really great English poet except perhaps Donne.

---

[1] This fact is all the more striking since a great proportion of the early Elizabethan drama based itself on the Homilies. See Henry Hitch Adams, English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642, New York, 1943. For a factual investigation see C. van der Spek, The Church and the Churchman in English Dramatic Literature Before 1642, Amsterdam, 1930.

Of course, the social developments from the High Calvinist doctrine were to drive this Anglican doctrine into a fatal alliance with the monarchy and with a political theory that could not survive the drive of society and its tendencies of organization. But the growth of Arminian doctrine in the English Church preserved and stated the dignity of man on the level of ideas, and preserved in a deliberate way ideals which Puritan political ideas managed to preserve only in spite of their real theological ends. The Anglican-Puritan antithesis is fruitful on both sides.

The question remains to be settled of the real source of the differences between the Anglican and the Puritan aesthetic. I believe there is some profit to be had from analyzing it in theological terms. Any really great artist must, as I have said, believe that the role of the human spirit in the universe is a meaningful one. I have no intention of claiming that the Puritan theology made this belief impossible for most of those who believed it. But the

Puritan rendered himself incapable of art in literature by the way his theology rendered him incapable of believing the second principle that is necessary to the equipment of a literary artist. The great poet must also believe instinctively that the things of earth and ideas themselves are real to the extent that they can enter into a poem and become symbols that will fuse matter and spirit. Any poem is a war with language, an attempt to break through the separation and artificiality of the word-symbol and to fuse word and thing into what is a symbol of another kind: a sacramental symbol. As Archibald MacLeish has said: "A poem should not mean, but be." In that sense poetry is a Means of Grace.[1]

---

[1] Mysticism is, of course, the plane on which the symbols of poetry and religion most thoroughly fuse. It is significant that Arminianism in England produced the figure of Crashaw and the values and purposes represented by Little Gidding, as well as the Cambridge Platonists. L'Abbe Brémond, in writing of "Devout Humanism" in France, says: (Henri Brémond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment réligieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de réligion jusqu'à nos jours*, four volumes to date, 1916-, translated K. L. Montgomery, *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, London, 1928, p. xiii.) "Did my scholarship and space allow, I would fain have shown how among the Anglicans of the first half of the seventeenth century was produced a temper analogous to French Devout Humanism, a foreshadowing of the Oxford Movement; thus showing also that the influence of French writers, and notably of Francois de Sales, was felt across the Channel." But Crashaw is the exception rather than the rule, however he and his fellow-converts served the arguments of Puritan propagandists. He also represents a stage of mysticism considerably below the ecstasies of a mystic of the Continental type. On the basis of my dealings with the essentials of Arminianism I must conclude that, however analogous this temper was to French Devout Humanism, it could be and was a product of almost exclusively English writings, attitudes and theology, which is during the

Sir Herbert Grierson has put these two principles thus in opening his Introduction to his edition of the Metaphysical Poets:

> Metaphysical Poetry, in the full sense of the term, is a poetry which, like that of the _Divina Commedia_, the _De Natura Rerum_, perhaps _Goethe's Faust_, has been inspired by a philosophical conception of the universe and the role assigned to the human spirit in the great drama of existence. These poems were written because a definite interpretation of the riddle, the atoms of Epicurus rushing through infinite empty space, the theology of the Schoolmen as elaborated in the catechetical disquisitions of St. Thomas, Spinoza's vision of life _sub specie aeternitatis_, beyond good and evil, laid hold on the mind and the imagination of a great poet, unified and illuminated his comprehension of life, intensified and heightened his personal consciousness of joy and sorrow, of hope and fear, by broadening their significance, revealing to him in the history of his own soul, a brief abstract of the drama of human destiny.

---

whole period strenuously differentiating itself from Rome. The mystical element is essentially peripheral. Donne and Herbert at least are on a plane below the shining, timeless, separated peace of mystic fulfillment; they are never free of the buffeting of the theology of their time. This English version of "Devout Humanism" has in it more of what should rather be called "Christian Humanism", or "Theological Humanism". Pattison's description of its growth and antecedents is, in general, accurate, although he tends, like others in the nineteenth century, to try to make the line of its development a direct one from the days of Henry VIII. It was actually more of a re-creation than this observation implies: (_Isaac Casaubon_, pp. 299-300.) "Anglo-Catholic theology is not a system of which any individual thinker can claim the invention. It arose necessarily, or by natural development, out of the controversy with the papal advocates as soon as that controversy was brought out of the domain of pure reason into that of learning. That this peculiar compromise, or via media, between Romanism and Calvinism developed itself in England, and nowhere else in Christendom, is owing to causes which this is not the place to investigate. But that it was the product, not of English soil, but of theological learning wherever sufficient learning existed, is evidenced by the history of Casaubon's mind, who now found himself, in 1610, an Anglican ready made, as the mere effect of reading the Fathers to meet Du Perron's incessant attacks."

> 'Poetry is the first and last of all knowledge - it is as immortal as the heart of man! Its themes are the simplest experiences of the surface of life,...but equally the boldest conceptions, the profoundest intuitions, the subtlest and most complex classifications and 'discourse of reason', if into these too the poet can 'carry sensation', make of them passionate experiences communicable in vivid and moving imagery, in rich and varied harmonies. 1

Prior to this impetus to poetry a man, to write poetry at all, must have some sense of the value of the thing he is doing; he must feel that the form of poetry can put into his ideas some element of truth that cannot be communicated any other way. Essentially, since poetry is, as Grierson and others before him have said, a carrying of sensation into ideas, a poet must have an instinctive faith that the things of experience are in themselves important and that they can convey truth in a mode of sensation and direct apprehension that is lost in the prosaic intellectual communication of experience. The significant thing about the Metaphysical Poets is that they concede more than most poets before them, or after them, to the intellectual mode, to the categories of philosophy and reason, and that nevertheless they strike these categories into the direct flame of sensuous emotional apprehension that makes poetry. They make the material object that their poetry is conveying into a more intense symbol in intellectual terms than most poets. They are at once the manifestations of a period of violent contrasts and severe intellectual and philosophic tensions, and,

---

1 Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century, Oxford, 1921, p. xiii.

in their success, a proof of the final ability of great poetry to reconcile these elements. To my mind their peculiar intensity comes from the fact that they have taken upon themselves to re-create the validity of the sacramental, the essentially poetic, symbol in a period when that symbol is under fierce attack. The element that makes this success possible, brief as it is, is the re-creation in England for the space of perhaps forty years, of a sense of religious symbolism which the advance of what we may call Puritan rationalism had almost obliterated. That re-creation, which also, be it noted, made religious poetry again possible, was the work of those theologians and churchmen who built the Anglican _via media_ in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[1] It is no accident that the beginnings of the Anglican-Puritan split lay in a quarrel about the validity of symbols, the Vestiarian controversy. Its stages are a reproduction in little of the philosophic development in England. The first defence by the Anglicans is merely on the basis of expediency and decency; Whitgift and the other defenders of the status quo claim that they, as well as the objectors to the vestments, believe that there is no validity in the wearing of the surplice as such.[1] Theirs is the rather weak position that these are "things indifferent", and that they must be observed because the Queen demands it. But with Jewel and Hooker we have a relatively rapid development, under the stress of apologetics, to the position that the symbol is real, that it has an actual operation and meaning in the earthly sphere. In the case of Hooker, Keble claims that

---

[1] Professor Battenhouse, in _Marlowe's Tamburlaine_, quite rightly points out the correspondence between the principles of the Zwinglian interpretation of the Lord's Supper and the Elizabethan theory of art. Zwingli held that all action is important as a "memorial" and all actions had equal sacredness attached to them. The Elizabethans, he demonstrates, believed that human reason can elucidate all the truths essential to salvation, and a poet can thus exercise all the functions essential to a priest. Nature, in this theology is as much the garment of God as is the Church. "Thus", he says, "Poetry, History, and Nature take on a religious significance as parts of a broad sacramental system. All things become symbols or signs." But such a philosophy and theology is subject to the law of diminishing returns; it ends in the antinomianism which was anathema to both of the principal theological parties. The fact is that Zwinglian ubiquitarianism is the target of attack from both Anglican and Puritan from the beginning, and further, Zwingli's theory of the Church (that it might include "besides Christians, certain religious pagans quite independent of Christian revelation",) was one of the principal grounds of Puritan attack on the Anglicans, from the days when Walter Travers made his first charges against Hooker's doctrines in his

---

sermons at the Temple until it constituted one of the main charges against Laud. There may be a vague correspondence between the two theories but it is pretty certain that any Elizabethan writer would have gone in fear of charges of heresy if this had been pointed out to him. As for reason's being able to demonstrate religious truth, the metaphysical poets are in the Anglican tradition I have noted in my discussion of the Lambeth Articles, in their manifestation of a distrust of pushing reason too far. In this connection, see Courtland D. Baker's article, "Certain Religious Elements in the English Doctrine of the Inspired Poet During the Renaissance", ELH, VI, (1939) 300-323.

[1] Note the conclusion to Archbishop Parker's "Advertisements" in setting the rules on vestments which began the active phase of the first dispute. The Queen, he says, is "not yet prescribinge these rules as lawes equivalent with the eternall word of God, and as of necessity to bynde the consciences of her subiectes in the nature of them considered in them-selves; Or as they shoulde adde any efficacye or more vertue of publique prayer and to the sacraments, but as temporall orders meere Ecclesiasticall, without any vague superstition, and as rules in some parte of discipline concerning decency, distinction, and order for the time."

his justification of ceremonies as valid leads to his modification of the doctrine of predestination and the High Calvinism in general which forms the core of his opponents' position. I have given the reasons and evidence for my belief that for Hooker the doctrinal change came first, from the influence of Baro and the party for which he speaks at Cambridge. However that may be, there is rapidly formed in the last twenty years of the sixteenth century a theological position which makes the doctrine of a sacramental church again possible, and with it the concept of the symbol in which poetry and religion can again be joined.

Professor Bush has summarized one of the outstanding characteristics of seventeenth-century literature in pointing out that

> Some peculiar and fundamental characteristics of seventeenth-century literature arise from the simultaneous embracing of different planes of knowledge and experience or the habit of immediate and almost unconscious transition from one to another. That is, in brief, the medieval allegorical instinct. Ultimately it springs from the religious belief in the divine unity of all things physical and spiritual, and it works through both intuition and formal logic in which all men were trained. But in the seventeenth century that belief operated in an enlarged terrestrial and celestial world, against a developing background of philosophic and scientific scepticism, so that the allegorical mode of thought and feeling now appears less instinctive and normal, more eccentric and 'quaint', than it did when its basic assumptions were universal and unquestioned, when the realm of knowledge had not been separated from the realm of faith. The result is 'metaphysical' poetry and prose. [1]

But philosophic and scientific scepticism were not the only elements that were working against this unity. Calvinistic theology had, to my mind, an even greater effect. Although the separation of faith and reason was in the latter part of the century the work of science and scepticism, there had been already an earlier disruption of them on the theological plane, and on the same plane a restoration of that sense of unity, preserving and making possible a kind of poetry and prose that was soon again to go under, when the second and secular wave struck it with full force. The heritage of the medieval had in this sense to be re-created, and it was re-created for a moment of history by the deliberate act of a school of theologians who made head against the divisive assumptions of Calvinism. By the time Sir Thomas Browne asserts that man is "that great and true Amphibium" he must also admit that he lives in "divided and distinguished worlds...one to sense...two to reason...." English Arminianism is in its beginnings a re-statement and rationalization of the claim that there are not two worlds to reason, but one. Browne is on the defensive philosophically; his whole work is an attempt to pull those two worlds back together again in poetic meaning, and his impulse and line of reasoning is religious, and Arminian. The whole work of the Cambridge Platonists is to the same end.[1] They too begin as theological Arminians.

---

[1] English Literature in the Early Seventeenth Century, pp. 37-38.

I may justify my reasoning here by an examination of what happened to the concept of the symbol, and its relation to language in this same period, especially what Calvinistic theology did to it. Among other things this may serve to make clear the inevitability of the alliance which developed early between Puritanism and science.

---

[1] See Ernst Cassirer, Die Platonische Renaissance in England und Die Schule von Cambridge.

For the fact is that the sacramental symbol of poetry is not possible in Calvinistic theology. What happened in England was that Calvinistic theology dictated the substitution of the mathematical, logical symbol for the integral symbol shared by religion and art. Messrs. Wellek and Warren distinguish them thus:

> Algebraic and logical 'symbols' are conventional, agreed-upon signs; but religious symbols are based on some intrinsic relation between 'sign' and thing 'signified', metonymic or metaphoric: the Cross, the Lamb, the Good Shepherd. In literary theory, it seems desirable that the word should be used in this sense: as an object which refers to another object but which demands attention also in its own right, as a presentation.[1]

The symbols of the mathematician, to quote another definition, "...have meanings in terms of relationships, not of substance; something in reality answers to them, but they are not supposed to be items in that reality."[2]

The Reformation attack on transubstantiation was, in effect, a limiting of the excesses that indiscriminate and vulgarized use of the sacramental symbol had led to. In the case of Luther the development did not go as far as it did with Calvin. For Luther the symbol retained a real operation in the material world; he only insisted on limiting it. Calvin could not be satisfied with anything less than a full separation. The Zwinglian ubiquitarianism had much the same effect since it refused to make any qualitative distinction between symbols.[1]

---

[1] Theory of Literature, p. 193.

[2] Suzanne Langer, Philosophy in a New Key, pp. 14-15.

---

[1] The two poles in theology have a general resemblance to the extremes in literature. If everything is a symbol without distinction achieved, artistic meaning is impossible; but if everything material is merely material, meaning is also hard to achieve. This point is clearly made in terms of the drama by S. L. Bethell (Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition, Durham, North Carolina, 1944, p. 3): "From time to time and from place to place the drama varies its position on a scale between two extremes of absolute conventionalism and absolute naturalism. At either extreme it would cease to be properly dramatic. Absolute conventionalism would work in symbols bearing no necessary relation to the things symbolized, and absolute naturalism would reproduce a 'slice of life' with more than photographic fidelity. The former would be devoid of emotive power, like symbols in algebra, whilst the latter would lack both intellectual and emotional organization." Calvinist theology denies the necessary connection between the symbol and the thing symbolized unless that connection is intellectual, and only intellectual. The Puritan objection to the stage may well have had its source in the subconscious refusal on their part to believe that this symbolization could be anything but evil, since it had a meaning and was in terms that were not completely intellectual. I feel that we might in general account for Shakespeare's art by saying that the effect of the Reformation in England was partly to choke off the outlet of symbol that the pre-Reformation church had provided, and that that power was then transferred to the secular drama, and so informed those channels that it was able to achieve the heights we know. The book from which I quote makes a very valuable point in showing how close Shakespeare was to the conventional in the popular dramatic tradition. The answer to what brought the popular dramatic tradition thus close to Shakespeare is a consideration which lies in the realm with which I have been dealing. Where everything becomes a symbol, as in Zwinglianism, there is ultimately no real meaning, and where nothing of immediate perception can be trusted as a symbol without the mediate mind, there is no area for the arts to convey meaning either. The Anglicans of the early seventeenth century had a two-front battle to fight: they attacked Rome for vulgarizing the symbol, but they also felt they

The symbol that the poet and artist can use, and which they seek to construct, has much more in common with the religious symbol than with the mathematical one. It says a great deal for the vitality of art (and it is to my mind the largest argument for the validity of the 'traditional' as against the 'liberal' theory of literature) that, after a long apprenticeship, artists were again able to make artistic symbolic productions out of the kind of aesthetic that the new rational mathematical symbol of the seventeenth century brought with it. But the grip of the Calvinist doctrine of absolute predestination had to be broken before any real poetry could come out of that side of the century's division. The literature of fact begins new types of writing in this period, the essay and the novel; and eventually they too become capable of carrying artistic values, as distinguished from the values of mere efficient communication. But if literary creations are concerned merely with purposes

---

had to defend the symbol's reality from the Puritans. Hooker's definition of the sacraments in beginning his discussion of this topic in Book V of the Polity is as follows (Everyman, p. 200): "As oft as we mention a Sacrament properly understood, (for in the writings of the ancient Fathers all articles which are peculiar to Christian faith, all duties of religion containing that which sense or natural reason cannot of itself discern, are most commonly named Sacraments,) our restraint of the word to some few principal divine ceremonies importeth in every such ceremony two things, the substance of the ceremony itself which is visible, and besides that somewhat else more secret in reference whereunto we conceive that ceremony to be a Sacrament." L. S. Thornton (Richard Hooker, a study of his theology, pp. 77 ff.) is critical of Hooker's doctrine of the sacraments because he says Hooker did not go far enough toward the Catholic doctrine. But the phenomenon of Hooker is that he went as far as he did against the forces which dominated the theology at the time.

of fact, if reality inheres by one's theology only in the things of another world and is not necessarily transferred into this world, much of the material and atmosphere with which an artist can work is vitiated.[1] Professor Bush has said that "...the religious imagination is the faculty by which we unite the broken and dispersed images of the world into an harmonious poetic symbol..."[2] but for the poetic symbol to become poetry the poet must believe in the validity of the images, and of their symbolic content. He must also believe that such a symbol can exist in the form of a poem. He must believe that it is possible to express truth this way. Literature, in general, was knowledge for the Puritan; it was power for the Anglican.[3]

---

[1] The Pietistic tradition which holds most strongly that there is no reality in this world, has been traditionally the most anti-intellectual.

[2] English Literature in the Early Seventeenth Century, p. 307.

[3] This sort of distinction brings me, of course, into the arena from which Mr. T. S. Eliot has only recently announced his retreat. Perhaps he might better have held his ground if he had chosen to found his statements about the Metaphysical Poets on less superficial bases than technique alone. "...they were", he says, ("The Metaphysical Poets", Selected Essays, New York, 1932, pp. 241-250), "at best, engaged in the task of trying to find the verbal equivalent for states of mind and feeling." He ignores the anterior vision and the faith they had in the integrity of flesh and spirit which, in an age of advancing materialism, forced them to try to connect the two. The re-creation of that continuity would not have seemed possible or necessary to them without their theological principles. And the establishment, or re-establishment of those principles was the work of the Anglican theologians whom I have investigated here. The significant thing is rather that these poets were able to believe that states of mind and feeling could contain truth, and that truth could be directly apprehended from these states of mind or feeling, without allegory or separation. The Puritan can believe that states of mind or feeling can contain

---

truth, but he is also convinced that truth must be first translated into intellectual modes. I cannot, of course, here go fully into the question of Milton as a poet, the rock on which Mr. Eliot's pronouncement foundered, more than to quote a summarizing statement about him from Paul Elmer More's essay on *Lycidas*. ("How to Read Lycidas", reprinted in *Criticism*, ed. Schorer, Miles, McKenzie, pp. 539-545.) "His [Milton's] is not Shakespeare's incalculable gift; it lacks the element of magic that captures us in Shakespeare; it is, or soon after his earliest experiments it was, an art that came by reflection, and as we read him we imagine that we might by equal deliberation attain the same perfection - only we never do attain it." (p. 539) It is a commonplace of literary history that Milton's 'earliest experiments' were inspired by an Anglican religious sensibility. I may venture, moreover, to suggest that Milton's recourse to the Grand Style, and the whole movement of style that led to the neo-classical of the eighteenth century, can be seen as in reality an attempt to adapt the mathematical symbol to the uses of poetry by forcing its terms. Poetry that rises from the true artistic-religious symbol has no need for any but its own style, since for this sensibility any object can carry real symbolic weight without forcing language across the gap. It is also significant, I think, that it was late in the seventeenth century that the doctrine grew up that some subjects and some vocabulary were 'poetic', others were not. For the metaphysicals any subject could be poetic; any image, and in any words. For them there is no separation. Mr. Eliot's religious position should dictate, I should think, not that he judge literature by the standards of theology (although he makes a plea for that in at least one place), but that his apprehension of a work of art should be on a level of unity such as the religious attitude demands: an achieved symbolic unity in the whole work. Instead he remains, as a critic, content to take the style, the technique, as the equivalent and guarantee of that achievement. As a critic he is content to allow the award of merit to a literary work which remains a mathematical, rather than a true artistic symbol. Professor Kenneth B. Murdock emphasizes this point in connection with his recent investigation of the relationship of *Literature and Theology in Colonial New England*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1949, p. 191): "The real forces in the growth of any literature can never be measured completely by changes in conventions of style or theme or by the formal development of literary genres. The fertilizing tradition is a matter of spirit and idea; the fruitful heritage of the past comes from ways of thought and feeling, fundamental intellectual and emotional points of view, which have the power to stimulate new attempts to map the changing current of life. Such things are hard to categorize; their nature defies

Calvinistic theology begins and ends with God the Absolute, and for the Puritan the world remains hopelessly sundered from God by the Fall. Whether prelapsarian, supralapsarian, or sublapsarian, the doctrine of predestination, the center of Calvinistic theology, puts a real and awful gap between this world and the 'real' world which makes any symbolic continuity between them impossible, or at the least, questionable. The complete depravity of human nature, moreover, makes any movement toward God impossible on the part of man. Certainly no symbol made with human hands is going to help man cross that gap; there can be no validity in the direct attempt of religious poetry to create a symbol that will do so. Says Calvin:

> Let it stand, therefore, as an indubitable truth, which no engines can shake, that the mind of man is so entirely alienated from the righteousness of God that he cannot conceive, desire, or design anything but what is wicked, distorted, foul, impure, and iniquitous; that his heart is so thoroughly envenomed by sin that it can breathe out nothing but corruption and rottenness. 1

This separation is not to be overcome by any creation of man; only by free grace through Christ. Calvinism, that is, rules grace entirely out of the realm of the natural. On the other hand, that theology which reserves the possibility of there being other means of Grace, such as the Sacraments and the Church, will be more likely, on the face of it, to assume

---

precise definition. Their influence comes in large part from the fact that they are living organisms, not static entities which can be exactly measured and weighed."

[1] Institutes, Book II, ch. v, 19.

that poetry too can be the equivalent of a means of Grace.[1] And what preserves and restores the possibility of Grace inhering in the things of the natural world for the English seventeenth century is the Anglican theological reaction to this Calvinistic theology, and this is the beginning, also, of Arminianism.

The beauty of Nature was not thereby destroyed for the Puritan, of course, as a source of pleasure, nor was it rendered entirely useless as a source of truth. It is only true that its importance and trustworthiness was seriously questioned if not vitiated. It is not true that the Puritan, as has been claimed, would not accept as true anything that came to him through the senses;[2] but it is true that he looked upon those données as "tropes", merely allegories of the true reality which lay in an intellectual sphere far beyond man's ability to comprehend, in the Mind of God. A poet must almost always trust his senses, and the fact that he is a poet indicates that he trusts them above his mind. For the Puritan, direct apprehension of sense impressions could not give man the experience of truth unless these apprehensions were first filtered through the intellect for the 'meaning', which had to be a simple intellectual one. From this basis it is that they insist that there can be only one sense natural to any passage of scripture. Professor Perry Miller has summed it up in The New England Mind thus:

---

[1] The following statement from an otherwise wholly mistaken thesis is another way of putting it, which suffers from too sharp a division between the two. An Arminian, for instance, would not have admitted that a man can become perfect in this life, and they would have insisted that truth would be found only by the authority of the Church plus the contribution of human reason. "To Milton and Calvin, truth is absolute in God, but never fully and finally obtainable in this life. The principal revelation is to be found in Scripture; but the fall has so blinded men, that they are able to recognize the truth only by additional revelation through the grace of God ....The Arminians...regarded truth as fully attainable in the Church and in other mediations between God and man; hence a man can become perfect in this life. In Calvin's system, then, the law of nature is the means God has given, and through which His spirit works, to enable man to test and determine truth. To the Arminians, the authority of the Church was sufficient to decide upon truth." (Joseph M. McDill, Milton and the Pattern of Calvinism, Nashville, Tenn., 1942.)

[2] Hooker's claim that the most powerful evidence that he received came through the senses quite rightly roused the Calvinistic ire of Walter Travers in their contest at the Temple (See Walton's Life of Hooker.) but Hooker's authority for this point is Aquinas, who traced man's inability to know the essence of God to the fact that our

> The Puritan aesthetic begins with the Ramist assumption of a natural order that has been summarized in the arts... 1

But I feel that the essential distinction between the Puritan and the Anglican is not isolated unless we add that this order is conceived of as an intellectual one, and that the mind was the center of the transmission of Grace for the Puritan; the means of Grace became for him intellectual: the Word, to the exclusion of any sacramental acts or ceremonies. As Miss White says:

---

understanding commences with sense; objects beyond sense cannot be grasped "except so far as knowledge is gathered of them through the senses" (Bk. I, Ch. iii.) This trusting in sense-impressions as the beginning of the way to truth contrasts with the Puritan who insists on the Scripture as the only source of truth.

[1] Page 238.

> [The Puritan] tended to confine himself to the printed page among the arts, and among the possible motions of the mind his preference was for the more ratiocinative. His passion for the truth, heroic as it was, bore heavily on imagination and sensibility, and his real fault is not so much the strenuousness for which he has been so unjustly blamed, as the literalness and self-sufficiency which his detractors have not always scrupled to emulate. 1

They could argue both ways, as Professor Miller notes, for the center of their concept of grace and its transmission was always the ratiocinative. Grace could come through the senses if they were subject to the correction of the principles of rational psychology. Professor Miller says:

> Whenever they attack the Church of England - or the Church of Rome - they deplore 'idolatry' and insist that grace is not to be confined to physical agents, to sacraments and rituals, but whenever they have to deal with an Anne Hutchinson, a Gorton, or a Fox, they contend with equal fervor that grace is never imparted to the soul except through a sensual impression, that it observes the orderly processes of rational psychology, and never produces an unnatural predominance of even sanctified passions over an enlightened reason. 2

There is actually no inconsistency here. Rational psychology for the Puritan was incurably intellectual. The sense impression must always be logically interpreted; the direct apprehension of truth in sensation and emotion which is the whole object of a lyric is hence suspect. The sense impression is always subordinate to the intellectual; it can never override it. For Jonathan Edwards the natural world contained only "Images or Shadows of Divine Things", not the

---

1 English Devotional Literature (prose), 1600-1640, p. 38.
2 The New England Mind, p. 286.

things themselves. As Professor Miller puts it in his introduction to his edition of this document of Puritan aesthetic:

> To find in the rose a symbol of the predicament of sinful man was allowable, but so to dwell upon its beauty that the rose became more moving than the predicament, or that the music of the words diverted attention from the thematic assertion, was to lose the spiritual in the corporeal. It was, said the Puritan, to make an idol out of nature, and that was a sin. [1]

That essential quality of poetry, that overrides both the sense impression and the intellectual idea with the peculiarly artistic emotion that fuses them both into a symbol with reality beyond them both, is impossible for this aesthetic. What happened to poetry Professor Miller has earlier summarized in The New England Mind:

> To a Ramist rhetorician, verse was simply a heightened form of eloquence, it was speech more plenteously ornamented with tropes and figures than prose, but still speech; like the oration, its function was to carry inartificial arguments from man to man. Poetry as well as prose, according to Richardson, was bestowed by God as a part of rhetoric, not because it was necessary in respect of things, but in respect of man, so that men might understand things more easily. [2]

The only kind of understanding here allowed to exist is the intellectual. For the Anglican, the object, the symbol, has a reality of its own, which can carry the immediacy of the experience as poetry directly to the reader. For him it is rather the intellect which is to be mistrusted. Hooker says:

---

[1] Images or Shadows of Divine Things, New Haven, Connecticut. 1948, p. 3. The almost wistful intentness of Edwards' struggles portrayed in this book is significant. He is so pathetically eager to establish rationally the symbolic content of nature, from the immediate apprehension of which his dogma has cut him off!

[2] Page 360.

> It greatly offendeth, that some, when they labour to shew the use of the holy Sacraments, assign unto them no end but only to teach the mind, by other senses, that which the word doth teach by hearing.

The sacraments for him are not

> ...bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, [nor] naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and of verity) for means effectual whereby God, when we take the Sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the Sacraments represent or signify. 1

A dissatisfaction with the limited symbolic reality that words, as words, offer, with the symbolic unreality of words, lies behind all poetry. The Puritan is satisfied that the word as it stands is all. The sensation only carries truth when it is translated into intellectual concepts. To quote Professor Miller again:

> By temperament and by deliberate intention the Puritan was less of an 'imagist' than the Anglican and more of an 'allegorist'. He was not insensible to beauty or sublimity, but in the face of every experience he was obliged to ask himself, What does this signify? What is God saying to me at this moment? 2

---

1 *Polity*, V, lvii, 1 & 5.

2 *Images or Shadows of Divine Things*, p. 4.
For one evidence of a direct connection of the poetic with the kind of theology that the Anglican revival kept alive and built up, see Miss White's discussion of Crashaw in *The Metaphysical Poets* (p. 221). Crashaw wrote a prefatory poem to Robert Shelford's *Five Pious and Learned Discourses* (Cambridge, 1635) entitled *"On a Treatise of Charity"*. One of these discourses was "A Sermon preferring holy Charity before Faith, Hope, and Knowledge," which insists on the thesis that it is not by knowledge that we are saved. (p. 57 ff.) The author launches his attack on

The division of sensibility that T. S. Eliot defined in the techniques of poetry and poetic apprehension in his essays on the metaphysical poets, has its real basis, I think, in this elementary shift in theology. The center of it is in the Calvinistic conception of God as Absolute Will, and of a real gulf between the two worlds, which substitutes for the real connection of nature with the divine an absolute division which only the intellect can bridge.[1] What

---

those who feel that they are to be saved only by the preaching of men. The Scriptures and the Sacraments, as well as all God's creatures are preachers, he claims. Faith converts the mind, but the greatest and last conversion is the heart and will by love. The Sacraments do what preachers cannot do, infuse grace into our souls. And even on the Puritan side, the practice of poetry was almost enough to change the poet's theology. Professor Murdock notes of Edward Taylor, whom Professor Miller characterizes as one of the two real poets of New England (Literature and Theology in Colonial New England, pp. 168-169): "Furthermore, although it is no doubt literally true, as his editor remarks, that Taylor nowhere makes the Sacrament into a rite mystically efficacious in itself, it is also true that the tone of his lyric adoration in many verses certainly evokes an emotion close to that felt by those Christians who regarded the Lord's Supper not simply as a commemorative rite, graced by the spiritual presence of Christ, but as a chance for the believer to achieve something like direct physical union with Him by actually eating and drinking His flesh and blood."

[1] Compare the comment of Professor Tillich ("The Idea and Ideal of Personality", The Protestant Era, p. 117.): "It is obvious that the danger of the Protestant humanist development of personality, especially on Calvinistic soil, is that of separation...." Calvinistic political theory rests on the same separation. Calvin says in his famous passage in the Institutes on Christian Obedience: "But whosoever can put difference between the body and the soul, between this present and transitory life and that life to come and eternal, he shall not hardly understand that the spiritual kingdom of Christ and the civil government are things far asunder....It is a Jewish vanity, to seek and enclose the kingdom of Christ under the elements of the world...." (A. S. P. Woodhouse, Puritanism and

resulted, after the religious phase of this concept had run its course, was the secular sort of positivism against which poetry and the arts must still struggle to-day. This reduces reality and experience to the service of the practical will, and carries with it a denial of any but intellectual cognition. Even in its beginnings it found itself unable to justify the existence of poetry. Science and rationalism used and contributed to this process, of course, but some

---

Liberty, p. 192.) Professor Tillich comments in another place: "But although this duality [of this world and the Kingdom of God] can never be overcome in time, space, and history, it makes a difference whether the duality is deepened into a bridgeless gap, as in periods in which autonomy and heteronomy fight with each other, or whether the duality is recognized as something which should not be and which is overcome fragmentarily by anticipation, so to speak, in a theonomous period." (*The Protestant Era*, p. 59.) Jung has called the history of Protestantism a history of continual iconoclasm, of separation of our consciousness from universal archetypes present in the subconscious. Calvinism plays its part in the process seen in these terms as well. Professor Tillich notes also that "The loss of sacraments and symbols corresponds to the exclusive emphasis on the center of personality in Protestantism; and both these facts correspond to the rise of the bourgeois ideal of personality for which the Reformation and the Renaissance are equally responsible." (*Ibid*., p. xxiv.) Professor Woodhouse has shown how this separation was of the essence of Puritanism: (*Puritanism and Liberty*, p. 42.) "Like everything else in the Puritan's outlook, the separation from his fellows rested on a dogmatic basis. The doctrine of predestination taught him that it was from the beginning. The Saint alone belonged to the order of grace, with its special equipment, its privileges and its duties. The possible inferences from this fact were various, but so long as the dogma remained unimpaired or uncircumvented, the attitude towards the natural man was constant." Our modern alienation, about which so much is being said, is to my mind our inheritance, through Hegel, from the theological doctrines which killed the symbolic life and dependability of nature, insisting that it be filtered through the dead grey matter of the mind. This is not to say, however, that Roman Catholicism retained it. The Council of Trent marks the end of Gothic symbolism in art. (See Emile Mâle, *Religious Art in France XIII Century*, transl. Dora Nussey, London, 1913, p. vii.)

sort of theological basis as this was necessary to get it under way.

The implications of this shift can be seen throughout the seventeenth century and after. There is the essential devaluation of "tropes", which Professor Miller summarizes in discussing Edwards' Images or Shadows of Divine Things, the insistence on allegory which, in the way the Renaissance and seventeenth century used it, is an admission of the separation rather than an attempt to unify the two spheres.

The Anglican's belief, on the other hand, saw "God and the world...in some mysterious way intermingled, the Visible with the Invisible, both being but two parts of the one reality in the mind of God."[1] He was convinced that human beings could affect their fate by their own efforts, and that the practice of art was a real means of effecting spiritual results. The aim of this thesis has been to outline, from the standpoint of its implications for art, the way in which this theological body of doctrine, which could and did again allow poetry for a brief period to develop as religious poetry, was developed out of a reaction to the central doctrine of Calvinistic theology: predestination. This reaction both helped to produce, and was the result of, an earlier impetus toward a truly sacramental church. The central element of the sacramental power is the actuality and reality of symbols, and an assumption of their real operation. The mind that cannot accept a symbol as real in a way that overrides the intellectual content of language, the mind that insists that the only function of language is intellectual communication, is fundamentally unable either to produce or to read poetry.

---

[1] R. G. Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church, I, 80. Usher's definition of the differences between the two remains the best short summary I have seen. His only fault is that he sentimentalizes the conclusions he draws therefrom. His book also ignores the theological side of the period he covers so fully on its political side. What I have attempted might almost be called the doctrinal dimension of his work.

The necessary preface to the restoration of a sacramental form and operation to the Church of England was the reassertion of a theology which allowed of freedom of the will. The connection of the two I have tried to make clear earlier. Briefly, if you reject the doctrine of absolute predestination to life or death which High Calvinism insisted upon, it makes some difference on what basis you reject it. In the case of English Arminianism it was done essentially to preserve the political institutions upon which government rested, to preserve an ideal of society which found it necessary to have a church with power on earth. Such a church needs a theology which will allow of a spiritual sanction for its acts, and in the end it requires a theology of free-will to assure that that power be accessible to men. It must provide some sacramental means by which man can be assured that his efforts on earth to attain salvation can be made effective. Those efforts must have a real existence. The sacraments of the Church must be real symbols, not mathematical ones which assume that what they stand for has no necessary operation in the natural world.

It is not enough that they be only visible words, as they were for the Puritan. Any concept of the function of literature that rests upon such an assumption is also not enough. Here, then, is the connection of the facts I have collected in the earlier chapters of this work with the development of English literature. It remains to connect it more closely with literary and artistic phenomena, but that must be a task for the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot, Robert,
De Gratia et Perseverantia Sanctorum...Quibus accessit Animadversio in Richardi Thomsoni Anglo-Belgici Diatribam de amissione et intercisione Iustificationis, & Gratia, Francofurti, 1618.

Adams, Henry Hitch,
English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642, New York, 1943.

Addleshaw, G. W. O.,
The High Church Tradition: A Study in the Liturgical Thought of the Seventeenth Century, London, 1941.

Allen, J. W.,
English Political Thought, 1603-1660, London, 1938.
______, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1928.

Andrewes, Lancelot,
A Pattern of Catechisticall Doctrine and other Minor Works of Lancelot Andrewes, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Volume II, Oxford, 1846.

Arnold, Matthew,
Literature and Dogma, New York, n.d.

Auden, W. H.,
Review of T. S. Eliot's *Notes Toward the Definition of Culture*, *The New Yorker*, April 23, 1949.

à Wood, Anthony,
Athenae Oxonienses; *Fasti Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss, Four Volumes, London, 1815.

Baker, Courtland D.,
"Certain Religious Elements in the English Doctrine of the Inspired Poet During the Renaissance", *ELH*, VI, (1939), 300-323.

Baker, Herschel,
The Dignity of Man, Cambridge, Mass., 1947.

Baker, Thomas,
History of the College of St. John the Evangelist, ed. John E. B. Mayor, Cambridge, 1869.

Bancroft, Richard,
A Sermon preached at Paule's Crosse the 9 of Februarie ...1588.

Barclay, Robert,
The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth, considered principally with reference to the Influence of Church Organization on the Spread of Christianity, London, 1877.

Barlow, William,
The Summe and Substance of the Conference, London, 1604.

Baro, Peter,
Autobiographical fragment, Baker MSS, Univ. Libr. Cambridge, xxix, 184-188.
______, *Cur frustus mortis Christi ad omnes Adami posteros non perveniat*, MS. Univ. Libr. Cambridge, Gg. 1.29. f. 46 ff.
______, *De Fide*, London, 1580.
______, *De Praestantia et dignitate divinae Legis*, London, 1586.
______, *God's Purpose and Decree taketh not away the Liberty of Man's Corrupt Will*, transl. John Ludham, London, 1590.
______, *In Jonam Prophetam Praelectiones 39*, London, 1579.
______, *A speciall Treatise of Gods Providence*...., transl. John Ludham, London, 1588.
______, *Summa Trium de Praedestinatione Sententiarum...Quibus accedunt Assertiones orthodoxae seu articuli Lambethani*, Hardrovici, 1513 (1613), ed. A. T [*hysius*].

Bastiaenen, Johannes Adam,
The Moral Tone of Jacobean and Caroline Drama, Amsterdam, 1930.

Battenhouse, Roy W.,
Marlowe's Tamburlaine, A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy, Nashville, Tenn., 1941.
______, "Measure for Measure and Christian Doctrine of the Atonement", *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 1029-1059.

Beecher, Edward,
"The Works of Samuel Hopkins", *Biblioteca Sacra*, X (1853), 70-76.

Bethell, S. L.,
Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition, Durham, North Carolina, 1944.

Birch, Thomas, ed.,
The Court and Times of James the First, Two Volumes, London, 1849.

Bredvold, Louis I.,
"The Religious Thought of Donne in Relation to Mediaeval and later Traditions", Studies in Shakespeare, Milton, and Donne, University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, No. I., Ann Arbor, Mich., 1925.

The British Museum Index Catalogue of Royal and King's MSS, Volume III, London, 1921.

Bronkema, Fred,
"The doctrine of common grace in reformed theology, or New Calvinism and the doctrine of common grace", typescript, Thesis, TH.D., Harvard, 1928.

Brown, Carleton F.,
"The Author of The Pearl Considered in the Light of his Theological Opinions", PMLA, XIX (1904), 115-145.

Bruce, John, ed.,
Diary of John Manningham, of the Middle Temple, Camden Society, Westminster, 1868.

Buckle, H. T.,
History of Civilization in England, New York, 1858.

Bullen, A. H., ed.,
"The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnevelt", in A Collection of Old English Plays, Four Volumes, London, 1883, II, 201-314.

Burnet, Gilbert,
Exposition of the xxxix Articles, Oxford, 1796.

Burrage, Champlin,
The Early English Dissenters, Two Volumes, Cambridge, 1912.

Burton, H.,
Israel's Fast, 1628.

Burton, Robert,
Anatomy of Melancholy, 1621, 1624, 1628, 1638.

Bury, J. B.,
The Idea of Progress, New York, 1932.

Bush, J. Douglas,
English Literature in the Early Seventeenth Century, Oxford, 1945.
_____, "Two Roads to Truth: Science and Religion in the Early Seventeenth Century", ELH, VIII (1941), 81-102.

Calhoun, R. L.,
"Theology and the Humanities", *The Meaning of the Humanities*, ed. T. M. Greene, Princeton, 1938.

Calvin, John,
Institutes of the Christian Religion, ed. John Allen, Two Volumes, Philadelphia, Pa., 1936.

Carleton, Sir Dudley,
The Speech of Sir Dudley Carleton Ambassadour for the King of Great Britaine...Touching the Discord and Troubles...caused by the...Doctrine of Arminius, Exhibited the 6 of October, 1617, London, 1618.

Carleton, George,
An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeal holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrine of the Church of England, Second Edition, 1626,
Includes: "A Ioynt Attestation Avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England was not impeached by the Synode of Dort."

Cassirer, Ernst,
Die Platonische Renaissance in England und Die Schule von Cambridge, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, Leipzig, 1932.

[L. Chaderton]
A fruitfull Sermon upon the 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. & 8 Verses of the 12 Chapiter of...Romanes, London, 1584.

Clark, Andrew,
"Dr. Plume's Pocket-Book", *The Essex Review*, XIV (1905).

Clark, G. N.,
The Seventeenth Century, Second Edition, Oxford, 1947.

Collier, Jeremy,
An ecclesiasticall history of Great Britain, ed. Th. Lathbury, Nine Volumes, London, 1847-1852.

Cooper, C. H., and T. Cooper,
Athenae Cantabrigienses, Two Volumes, Cambridge, 1861.

Craig, Hardin,
The Enchanted Glass, Oxford, 1936.

Craig, Hardin, Jr.,
"The Geneva Bible as a Political Document", typescript, Thesis, Ph.D., Harvard, 1937.

Crane, Ronald S.,
"Anglican apologetics and the idea of progress, 1699-1745," *Modern Philology*, XXXI (1934), 273-306; 349-372.

Cunningham, William,
The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation, Edinburgh, 1862, 1866.

Daiches, David,
The King James Version of the English Bible, Chicago, 1941.

Dark, Sidney,
Seven Archbishops, London, 1944.

Darlow, T. H., and H. F. Moule,
Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Vol. I, - English, London, 1903.

Davies, Godfrey,
"Arminian versus Puritan in England ca. 1620-1640", *Huntington Library Bulletin*, V (1934), 157-179.
_____, "English Political Sermons, 1603-1640", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, III (1939), 1-22.
_____, *The Early Stuarts*, Oxford, 1945.

Davis, Robert Gorham, Auden, Greenberg, *et al*, "The Question of the Pound Award", *Partisan Review*, May, 1949, 512-522.

Dawson, Christopher,
Religion and Culture, London, 1948.

Dictionary of National Biography.

Dillingham, William,
Lawrence Chaderton, D.D., translated from a Latin memoir...by E. S. Schuckburgh, Cambridge, 1884.

Dowden, John,
Outlines of the History of the Theological Literature of the Church of England, S.P.C.K., London, 1897.

Du Moulin, Peter,
The Anatomy of Arminianism, 1626.

Eliot, Thomas Stearns,
Notes Toward the Definition of Culture, New York, 1949.
_____, "Religion and Literature", *Essays Ancient and Modern*, New York, 1936.
_____, *Selected Essays, 1917-1932*, New York, 1932.

Featley, Daniel,
Pelagius Redivivus, London, 1626.

Fisher, George Park,
History of Christian Doctrine, New York, 1906.

Foster, Herbert D.,
"International Calvinism Through Locke and the Revolution of 1688", American Historical Review, XXXII, (1927), 475 ff.

Frere, W. H.
The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., London, 1904.

Fuller, Thomas,
The Church History of Britain, ed. J. S. Brewer, Six Volumes, Oxford, 1865.
_____, The History of the University of Cambridge, ed. James Nichols, London, 1840.

G., F., ed.,
Articuli Lambethani, London, 1651.

Gardiner, Samuel R.,
History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, Ten Volumes, London, 1895.

_____, The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, Oxford, 1906.

Girardeau, John Lafayette,
Calvinism and evangelical Arminianism Compared...., Columbia, South Carolina, 1890.

Goad, Thomas,
"A Disputation, Partly Theological, Partly Metaphysical, Concerning the Necessity and Contingency of Events in the World in Respect of God's Decrees", Collection of Tracts, ed. Paine and Bellman, Cambridge, 1719.

Greenough, Chester Noyes,
A Bibliography of the Theophrastan Character in English, Cambridge, Mass., 1947.

Grierson, Herbert J. C.,
The First Half of the Seventeenth Century, Edinburgh and London, 1906.
_____, Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century, Oxford, 1921.
_____, Two Dutch Poets, The Taylorian Lecture, Oxford, 1936.

Grotius, Hugo,
Hugonis Grotii Operum Theologicorum, Four Volumes, Amsterdam, 1679.

H., E.,
De Fide, Eiusque Ortu et Natura contra P. Baronis....,
London, 1592.

Hall, Joseph,
Via Media: The Way of Peace. In the five busy Articles, commonly known by the name of Arminius:....,
1622.
_____, *Works*, Twelve Volumes, Oxford, 1837-1839.

Haller, William,
The Rise of Puritanism, New York, 1938.

Hardwick, Charles,
A History of the Articles of Religion, Cambridge and
London, 1859.

Harrison, A. W.,
Arminianism, London, 1937.
_____, *The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort*,
London, 1926.
_____, *"The Church of England Reaction from Calvinism in the Seventeenth Century"*, *Religion in Life*, XIII (1944),
213-224.

Harrison, G. B.,
A Jacobean Journal, New York, 1941.

Harsnett, Samuel,
Nemo necessario damnatur;
Certitudo uniuscujusque salutis non est certitudo
fidei, MS. B.M. Harleian, 3142, f. 92, 54a - 61b.

Hastings, James, ed.,
Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, New York, 1908.

Henderson, G. D.,
"Arminianism in Scotland", *London Quarterly Review*,
157 (1932), 493-504.

Henson, Herbert Hensley,
The Church of England, Cambridge, 1939.
_____, *Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century*,
London, 1903.

Herr, Alan F.,
The Elizabethan Sermon, Philadelphia, Pa., 1940.

Heylyn, Peter,
Aerius Redivivus or, the History of the Presbyterians, etc., Oxford, 1670.
_____, *Examen Historicum*, London, 1659.

______, *ΚΕΙΜΗΛΙΑ 'ΕΚΚΛΝΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΑ*. *The Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts of the Reverend and Learned Peter Heylyn, D.D.*, London, 1681.

Heywood, James, and Thomas Wright,
Cambridge University Transactions during the Puritan Controversies of the 16th and 17th Centuries, Two Volumes, London, 1854.

Hickman, Henry,
Historia Quinq-Articularis Exarticulata, or Animadversions on Dr. Heylin's Quinquarticular History, 1673.

______, *Laudensium Apostasia*, London, 1660.

Higginson, James J.,
Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar in relation to Contemporary Affairs, New York, 1912.

Historia de Articulis Lambethanis, MS. B.M. Harleian, 3142, f. 82 ff.

Historical MSS. Commission
Calendar of MSS. at Hatfield House, Part V. London, 1894.

Hobbes, Thomas,
Behemoth, in Frances Maseres' Select Tracts relating to the Civil Wars in England, in Two Parts, Part II, London, 1815, 457-653.

Houk, R. A.,
Hooker's Ecclesiasticall Polity, Book VIII, New York, 1931.

Hulme, T. E.,
Speculations, Second Edition, London, 1936.

Hunt, John,
Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of the Last Century, Two Volumes, London, 1870,

Husain, Itrat,
The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne, S.P.C.K., London, New York, 1938.

______, *The Mystical Element in the Metaphysical Poets of the Seventeenth Century*, Edinburgh and London, 1948.

Hutchinson, Lucy,
Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, Tenth Edition, London, 1863.

Hutton, William H.,
The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne, London, 1903.

Hyma, Albert,
"Calvinism and Capitalism in the Netherlands, 1555-1700", *The Journal of Modern History*, X (1938), 321-343.
_____, *The Life of Hugo Grotius*, typescript.

Hyperius, Andreas,
The Practise of Preaching, transl. John Ludham, London, 1577.

J., R.,
The Spy, Discovering the danger, etc., Strasburg, 1628.

Jackson, Thomas,
Works, Three Volumes, London, 1673.

Jackson, Thomas,
The Life of John Goodwin, London, 1872.

Jenkins, Claude,
"Church and Religion in the Age of Shakespeare", *History*, XV (1930), 199-215.

Jones, Richard F.,
Ancients and Moderns; A Study of the Background of the Battle of the Books, Washington Univ. Studies, New Series, Language and Literature 6, St. Louis, 1936.

Jones, Rufus,
Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries, London, 1928.

Jordan, Wilbur K.,
The Development of Religious Toleration in England, Four Volumes, Vol. I, London, 1932, Vol. II, Cambridge, Mass., 1936.

Keble, John,
The Works of...Mr. Richard Hooker, Three Volumes, Oxford, 1836.

Kelley, Maurice,
This Great Argument, Princeton, N. J., 1941.

Kennedy, W. P. M.,
Studies in Tudor History, London, 1916.

Kern, Edith G.,
The Influence of Heinsius and Vossius Upon French Dramatic Theory, Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra. Vol. XXVI, Baltimore, 1949.

Kirby, Ethyn Williams,
William Prynne, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
_____, "The Lay Feoffees: A Study in Militant Puritanism", The Journal of Modern History, XIV (1942), 1-25.

Knappen, M. M.,
"The Early Puritanism of Lancelot Andrewes", Church History, II (1933), 95-104.
_____, Tudor Puritanism, Chicago, 1939.
_____, Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, American Society of Church History, Chicago, 1933.

Knight, W. S. M.,
The Life and Works of Hugo Grotius, The Grotius Society Publications, No. 4, London, 1925.

Knuttel, W. P. C.,
Catalogus van de pamfletten-verzameling berustende in de Kononklijke bibliotheek, Nine Volumes in Eleven, 's Gravenhage, 1889-1920.

Krapp, Robert Martin,
Liberal Anglicanism, 1636-1647, Ridgefield, Conn., 1944.

Krutch, Joseph Wood,
"The Tragic Fallacy", in Criticism; The Foundations of Modern Literary Judgment, ed., Mark Schorer, Josephine Miles, and Gordon McKenzie, New York, 1948.

L., T.,
A Voyce out of the Wilderness, London, 1651.

Langer, Suzanne,
Philosophy in a New Key, Penguin Books, New York, 1948.

Laski, Harold,
The Rise of Liberalism, New York, 1936.

Laurence, Richard,
An attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England, which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical, in Eight Sermons...., Bampton Lectures, Oxford, 1805.

Lee, R. W.,
Hugo Grotius, Proceedings of the British Academy, XVI, London, 1930.

Levin, Harry,
"Literature as an Institution", in Criticism, ed. Schorer, Miles, McKenzie, New York, 1948.

Lovejoy, A. O.,
"The Entangling Alliance of Religion and History", The Hibbert Journal, V (1907), 258-276.

Ludham, John,
The Course of Christianitie, London, 1579.

McAdoo, H. R.,
The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology, London, New York, Toronto, 1949.

McClennen, Joshua,
On the Meaning and Function of Allegory in the English Renaissance, Univ. of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, No. 6, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1947.

McDill, Joseph M.,
Milton and the Pattern of Calvinism, Nashville, Tenn., 1942.

McFetridge, Nathaniel S.,
Calvinism in History, Philadelphia, 1882.

McGiffert, Arthur C.,
"Calvin's Theory of the Church", Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects...Testimonial to C. A. Briggs, New York, 1911.
_____, Protestant Thought Before Kant, New York, 1931.

McNeill, John T.,
"The Church in Post-Reformation Reformed Theology", The Journal of Religion, XXIV (1944), 96-107.

Machen, Arthur,
Hieroglyphics, London, 1923.

Makower, Felix,
Constitutional History and Constitution of the Church of England, London, 1895.

Mâle, Émile,
Religious Art in France XIII Century, transl. Dora Nussey, London, 1913.

Mathew, David,
The Jacobean Age, London, 1938.
_____, The Social Structure in Caroline England, Oxford, 1948.

Mathews, W. R., ed.,
Dogma In History and Thought, London, 1929.

Miller, Perry, ed.,
Images or Shadows of Divine Things, by Jonathan Edwards, New Haven, Conn., 1948.
_____, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity", Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXXII (1937).
_____, The New England Mind, New York, 1939.

Molhuysen, Philip Christiansen,
Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius, Rijks Geschiedkundige Publication LXIV, Two Volumes, 'S Gravenhage, 1928.

Montagu, Richard,
Diatribae Upon the First Part of the Late History of Tithes, London, 1621.

Montgomery, K. L., tr.,
A Literary History of Religious Thought in France, London, 1928.

More, Paul Elmer, and Frank Leslie Cross,
Anglicanism, The Thought and Practice of the Church of England...., Milwaukee, Wis., 1935.

More, Paul Elmer,
"How to Read Lycidas", in *Criticism*, ed., Schorer, Miles, McKenzie, New York, 1948.

Motley, John L.,
The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Two Volumes, New York, 1874.

Mozley, J. B.,
The Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, London, 1855.

Mullinger, James Bass,
Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century, London and Cambridge, 1867.
_____, *The University of Cambridge*, Three Volumes, Cambridge, 1884.

Murdock, Kenneth B.,
Literature and Theology in Colonial New England, Cambridge, Mass., 1949.
_____, *The Sun at Noon*, New York, 1939.

Neal, Daniel,
The History of the Puritans, ed., Joshua Toulmin, Five Volumes, Boston, 1817.

Neile, Richard,
M. Ant. de Dominis, archbishop of Spalatro, his shiftings in religion...., 1624.

Neve, J. L.,
"Arminianism in its influence upon England", *Biblioteca Sacra*, 88 (1931), 145-165.

Newland, Henry,
The Life...of Antonio de Dominis, Oxford and London, 1859.

Newman, John Henry,
Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification, London, 1900.

Nichols, James,
Calvinism and Arminianism compared in their Principles and Tendency:..., London, 1824.
_____, ed., *The Works of James Arminius D.D....Translated from the Latin in three volumes. The first and second by James Nichols, the third, with a sketch of the life of the author by Rev. W. R. Bagnall*, Auburn and Buffalo, 1853.

Niebuhr, Reinhold,
Beyond Tragedy, New York, 1938.

Nobbs, Douglas,
Theocracy and Toleration, Cambridge, 1938.

Northrop, F. S. C.,
The Meeting of East and West, New York, 1949, review "A Clouded Vision", *Times Literary Supplement*, August 5, 1949, 497-498.

Notestein, Wallace, and Frances Helen Relf, edd.,
Commons Debates for 1629, *Univ.* of Minn., Studies in the Social Sciences, No. 10, Minneapolis, 1921.

Ogg, David,
Europe in the Seventeenth Century, Fourth Edition, London, 1943.

Olert, John,
Predestination: Calvin and the New England Theology, typescript, Thesis, M.Th., Union Theological Seminary, 1943.

Oliver, Leslie M.,
"The Seventh Edition of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*", *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, XXXVII (1943), 243-260.

Ollard, S. L.,
Dictionary of English Church History, London, 1912.

Ottley, Robert L.,
Lancelot Andrewes, Boston, 1894.

Overall, Nadine Webb,
John Overall, 1560-1619, typescript, Thesis, Ph.D., Yale, 1947.

Overton, John Henry,
The Church in England, Two Volumes, London, 1897.

Pamp, Frederic E., Jr.,
"Walton's Redaction of Hooker", Church History, XVII (1948), 95-116.

Pattison, Mark,
Isaac Casaubon, London, 1875.

Perkins, William,
A Treatise Tending Unto a Declaration Whether a Man Be in the Estate of Damnation or in the Estate of Grace;...., Cambridge, 1612.

Perry, G. G.,
History of the Church of England, New York, 1876.

Pienaar, W. J. B.,
English Influences in Dutch Literature and Justus van Effen as Intermediary, Cambridge, 1929.

Plaifere, John,
Appeal to Gospel for True Doctrine of Divine Predestination, 1651.

Potter, Christopher,
Letter to Mr. Vicars, vindicating his sentiments touching the Predestinarian Controversies, 1629, reprinted in Collection of Tracts, ed. Paine and Bellman, Cambridge, 1719.

Powicke, F. M.,
The Reformation in England, Oxford, 1941.

Proceedings against Dr. Overall for unsound notions at Cambridge, B.M. MS. Harleian, 3142 f. 92.

Prynne, William,
Anti-Arminianisme or the Church of England's Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme, 1629.
The second edition much enlarged, 1630.
_____, A Breviate of the Life of William Laud, London, 1624.
_____, Canterburies Doome, London, 1646.
_____, God No Impostor Nor Deluder, 1629, 1630.
_____, The Perpetuitie of A Regenerate Mans Estate, London, 1626.

Rand, Edward K.,
Founders of the Middle Ages, Cambridge, Mass., 1941.

Randall, John Herman,
The Making of the Modern Mind, Boston, 1940.

Ranke, Leopold van,
A History of England, Six Volumes, Oxford, 1875.

Roberts, B. D.,
Mitre and Musket, Oxford, 1938.

Roberts, George, ed.,
Diary of Walter Yonge Esq., Camden Society, London, 1848.

Robertson, H. M.,
Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism: A Criticism of Max Weber and his School, Cambridge, 1933.

Robinson, Hastings, ed.,
Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, The Parker Society, Two Volumes, Cambridge, 1846-1847.

Rogers, Thomas,
The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England, The Parker Society, Cambridge, 1854.

Rous, Francis,
Mr. Rowse his speech made in the lower house of Parliament, London, 1642.
_____, *Testis Veritatis*, London, 1626.

Russel, A. T.,
Memoirs of...Lancelot Andrewes, Cambridge, 1860.

Sandys, Edwin,
The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D.D., ed. John Ayre, The Parker Society, Cambridge, 1841.

Santayana, George,
Poetry and Religion, New York, 1911.

Sargeaunt, W. D.,
"The Lambeth Articles", *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XII (1911), 251-260; 427-436.

Schaff, Philip,
The Creeds of Christendom, Three Volumes, New York, 1878.

Schorer, Mark, Josephine Miles, and Gordon McKenzie,
Criticism: The Foundations of Modern Literary Judgment, New York, 1948.

Shelford, Robert,
Five Pious and Learned Discourses, Cambridge, 1635.

[Sheppard, Samuel.]
The Times Displayed in Six Sestyads...., 1626.

Singleton, Charles,
An Essay on the Vita Nuova, Cambridge, Mass., 1948.

Sisson, C. J.,
The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker, Cambridge, 1940.

Smith, Herbert Maynard,
"Development of Anglican Theology after the Reformation", in *Report of the Cheltenham Church Congress*, London, 1928.

Smith, Preserved,
The Age of the Reformation, New York, 1920.
_____, *A History of Modern Culture*, New York, 1930.

Spencer, Theodore,
Shakespeare and the Nature of Man, New York, 1942.

Stearns, Raymond P.,
Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands, The American Society of Church History, Chicago, 1940.

Steward, Richard,
Three Sermons preached by...Dr. Richard Stuart, Second Edition, London, 1658.

Stimson, Dorothy,
"Puritanism and the New Philosophy in 17th Century England", *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine*, III (1935).

Strype, John,
Annals of the Reformation...., Four Volumes, Oxford, 1728, 1829.
_____, *Historical Memorials Ecclesiastical and Civil, of Events Under the Reign of Queen Mary I*, London, 1721.
_____, *The Life and Acts of...John Whitgift D.D.*, Three Volumes, Oxford, 1822.

Tanner, J. R., ed.,
Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I, Cambridge, 1930.

Tawney, R. H.,
Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, Pelican Books, New York, 1947.

Thompson, Beatrice M. Hamilton,
"Archbishop Whitgift and the Lambeth Articles", *Church Quarterly Review*, CXVII (1933), 25-52.

Thornton, L. S.,
Richard Hooker, a Study of his Theology, S.P.C.K., London, 1924.

Tillich, Paul,
The Protestant Era, Chicago, 1948.

Timperley, C. H.,
Encyclopedia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote, London, 1842.

Toynbee, Philip,
"The Novels of Henry Green", *Partisan Review*, May, 1949, 487-497.

Trevor-Roper, H. R.,
Archbishop Laud, London, 1940.

Trew, John,
The Cause of Contention in the King's Bench, Bodleian MS. 53, ff. 116-124.

Trilling, Lionel,
"A Rejoinder to Mr. Barrett", *Partisan Review*, June, 1949, 653-658.

Troeltsch, Ernst,
The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, Olive Wyon, transl., Two Volumes, London, 1931.

Tulloch, John,
English Puritanism and Its Leaders, Edinburgh, 1861.
_____, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*, Two Volumes, Edinburgh, London, New York, 1872.

Tuve, Rosamund,
"Ramus and Metaphysical Poetics", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, III (1942), 365-400.
_____, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery*, Chicago, 1948.

Udall, John,
The State of the Church of England laid open...., ed. Edward Arber, London, 1879.

Usher, Roland Green,
The Reconstruction of the English Church, Two Volumes, New York, 1910.
_____, "The Supposed Origin of the Divine Right of Bishops", *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à M. Charles Bémont*, Paris, 1913, 539-547.

Van der Spek, C.,
The Church and the Churchman in English Dramatic Literature Before 1642, Amsterdam, 1930.

Van Itterzon, G. P.,
"Koning Jacobus I en de Synode van Dordrecht", *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, New Series, XIV (1931), 187-204.

Venn, John, and J. A. Venn,
The Book of Matriculations and Degrees...University of Cambridge, 1544-1659, Cambridge, 1913.

Wakeman, Henry Offley,
The Church and the Puritans, 1570-1660, London, 1887.

Walker, Williston,
History of the Christian Church, New York, 1924.

Walton, Izaak,
The Lives, The World's Classics, London, New York, Toronto, 1927.

Warren, Austin,
Rage for Order, Chicago, 1948.

Warwick, Sir Philip,
Memoires of the Reign of King Charles I, Edinburgh, 1813.

Watt, Robert,
Bibliotheca Britannica, Four Volumes, Edinburgh, 1824.

Weber, Max,
The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, transl. Talcott Parsons, London, 1930.

Wellek, Rene, and Austin Warren,
Theory of Literature, New York, 1949.

Wendell, Barrett,
The Temper of the Seventeenth Century in English Literature, New York, 1904.

Westcott, Brooke Foss,
A General View of the History of the English Bible, Third Edition, revised by William A. Wright, London, 1908.

White, F. O.,
The Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops, London, 1898.

White, Helen C.,
English Devotional Literature (prose), 1600-1640, Uni. of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 24, Madison, Wis., 1931.
______, *The Metaphysical Poets. A Study in Religious Experience*, New York, 1936.

White, William,
Comparative Views of the Controversy Between the Calvinists and the Arminians, Two Volumes, Philadelphia, 1817.

Whitehead, Alfred North,
Adventures of Ideas, New York, 1933.

Whitgift, John,
The Works of John Whitgift, ed. John Ayre, The Parker Society, Three Volumes, Cambridge, 1851-1853.

Willey, Basil,
The Seventeenth-Century Background, New York, 1934.

Williams, A. T. P.,
The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England, London, 1947.

Wilson, J. Dover,
"Martin Marprelate and Shakespeare's Fluellen", *Library, Third* Series, III, (1912), 270.

Winwood, Sir Ralph,
Memorials of Affairs of State...., Three Volumes, London, 1725.

Womock, Laurence,
The Examination of Tilenus Before the Triers, in *Collection of Tracts*, ed. Paine and Bellman, Cambridge, 1719.

Woodhouse, A. S. P.,
Puritanism and Liberty, London, 1938.

Wright, Conrad,
"Edward and the Arminians on the Freedom of the Will", typescript, Helen Choate Bell Prize Essay, Harvard College, 1942.

Wright, Louis B.,
"The Significance of Religious Writings in the English Renaissance", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, I (1940), 59-68.

_____, "William Perkins: Elizabethan Apostle of Practical Divinity", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, III (1940), 171-196.

Yates, John,
God's Arraignment of Hypocrites, 1615.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS